

ENGLISH
USAGE
—
HALL



921

LOS ANGELES
STATE NORMAL SCHOOL



ENGLISH USAGE

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND USES
OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES

BY

J. LESSLIE HALL, Ph.D., Litt.D.

PROFESSOR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE COLLEGE OF
WILLIAM AND MARY; TRANSLATOR OF BEOWULF, AND OF JUDITH, PHOENIX.
AND OTHER ANGLO-SAXON POEMS; AUTHOR OF "OLD ENGLISH
IDYLS," "HALF-HOURS IN SOUTHERN HISTORY," ETC.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
CHICAGO NEW YORK

41170

COPYRIGHT 1917 BY
SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

10
120
n 1 +
Cope

To
PROFESSOR BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE
THE DEAN OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PREFACE

It is often said that a preface is unnecessary. I feel, however, that I should write one to set forth the object and the scope of this volume.

I have long felt that not only purists but a far better class of men were putting us, teachers and pupils and general public, in strait-jackets. Distinguished grammarians and eminent rhetorical scholars condemn in their books many words and phrases that we see all through the literature. They seem at times to combine to expel from the language some locution that we have heard frequently from attractive speakers and have seen often in the works of eminent writers.

The idea has frequently occurred to me while teaching usage with certain popular textbooks in hand that I was criticizing and correcting sentences that might have been taken from the most distinguished authors. Words mercilessly condemned by these textbooks would fall from the lips of some distinguished speaker that addressed the students the very day on which these words had been treated as barbarisms in the English lecture room. But I had no definite statements with which to controvert the textbook: I might theorize but had no facts to offer.

After Professor Lounsbury published his *Standard of Usage in English*, I determined to search the literature and see how far some of the disputed words and phrases are recognized by reputable authors. I have studied about a hundred and twenty-five locutions condemned more or less vehemently by purists, pedants, verbalists, grammarians, and professors of rhetoric. I have traced these locutions through more than seventy-five thousand pages of English and American litera-

ture, most of my reading being in pure literature, but some of it in the works of scholars and linguists whose usage I thought worth recording and citing. Some of my authors are among the "lesser lights" of literature; men who, though not very eminent, may be regarded as having a genius for idiom. I have held back statistics collected from the books of men who, though known to some of us as authors of valuable treatises, might not be known to the majority of my readers. For instance, I have rarely used statistics from the books of a certain well-known writer because I do not regard him as anything of a stylist, though I find him quoted pretty frequently by a foreign scholar who is studying the English language critically.

I have tried to write, not as a partisan, but as a historian of usage. I give the authorities *pro* and *con*, record the usage, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. I have not looked for certain words and phrases, but simply noted them in my reading. I have no pet words to defend, no detested words to vilify. I am not recommending this or that locution, but simply showing how often it is found in seventy-five thousand or more pages of good English.

I wish to acknowledge my obligation to the late Professor T. R. Lounsbury and to Professor John R. Slater for valuable suggestions, most of which I have willingly adopted.

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA,

March 15, 1917.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	5
SECTION	
I. Introduction	11
II. <i>Accept of</i>	27
III. Adjectives Not Compared.....	28
IV. Adverbs Used as Adjectives.....	30
V. <i>After</i> for <i>Afterwards</i>	38
VI. <i>Athletics</i> —Singular or Plural?.....	39
VII. <i>At Length</i> = <i>At Last</i>	40
VIII. <i>Beat</i> for <i>Defeat</i>	42
IX. <i>Between Each</i> (or <i>Every</i>).....	43
X. <i>But</i> + Nominative	44
XI. <i>Calculated</i> + the Infinitive	47
XII. <i>Can</i> as an Independent Verb.....	49
XIII. <i>Catch a Post, Train, Boat, etc</i>	50
XIV. <i>Catched</i> for <i>Caught</i>	51
XV. <i>Collect a Bill</i>	52
XVI. <i>Commence</i> + the Infinitive.....	52
XVII. Concord of Verb and Subject.....	53
XVIII. <i>Consider</i> for <i>Regard</i>	58
XIX. <i>Conspire</i> = <i>Concur, Agree</i>	60
XX. <i>Constant(ly)</i> = <i>Continual(ly)</i>	61
XXI. <i>Cotemporary</i> = <i>Contemporary</i>	63
XXII. <i>A Couple of</i> for <i>Two</i>	64
XXIII. <i>Cultured</i> as Adjective.....	66
XXIV. <i>Dead Corpse</i>	67
XXV. <i>Demean</i> = <i>Debase, Degrade Oneself</i>	68
XXVI. <i>Description</i> = <i>Kind, Sort</i>	69
XXVII. <i>Difficltly</i>	70
XXVIII. <i>Directly</i> as a Conjunction.....	71
XXIX. <i>Donate</i>	73
XXX. Double Comparatives and Superlatives.....	74
XXXI. The Double Negative.....	75
XXXII. <i>Dove</i> for <i>Dived</i>	78

SECTION	PAGE
XXXIII. <i>Drank</i> as a Participle.....	79
XXXIV. <i>Eat</i> for <i>Ate</i>	80
XXXV. <i>Eat</i> for <i>Eaten</i>	81
XXXVI. <i>Editorial</i> as a Noun.....	82
XXXVII. <i>Either</i> = <i>Each of Two</i>	84
XXXVIII. <i>Either</i> Referring to More than Two.....	85
XXXIX. Forms in <i>Else</i> and <i>Else's</i>	86
XL. <i>Encounter</i>	89
XLI. <i>Ever So</i> and <i>Never So</i>	90
XLII. <i>Every</i> as a Pronoun.....	94
XLIII. <i>Evidence</i> as a Verb.....	95
XLIV. <i>Exceute</i> = Put to Death.....	96
XLV. <i>Experience</i> as a Verb.....	98
XLVI. <i>Female</i> as a Noun.....	99
XLVII. <i>First Two</i> or <i>Two First?</i>	104
XLVIII. <i>Firstly</i>	107
XLIX. Foreign Plurals Anglicized.....	109
L. <i>Gotten</i>	109
LI. <i>Graduate</i> as an Active Verb.....	113
LII. <i>Grateful</i> = <i>Pleasant</i>	114
LIII. <i>Grow Small</i>	115
LIV. <i>Had Rather</i>	116
LV. <i>Have Got</i> for <i>Have</i>	121
LVI. <i>Heighth</i> (<i>Highth</i>) for <i>Height</i>	124
LVII. <i>I Am Mistaken</i> , etc.....	125
LVIII. <i>I Presume</i> = <i>I Dare Say</i> , <i>Believe</i> , etc.....	127
LIX. <i>I Take It</i> = <i>I Understand</i> , <i>Suppose</i> , etc.....	128
LX. <i>Immense</i> and <i>Immensely</i>	129
LXI. <i>Implicit Confidence</i>	130
LXII. <i>In Our</i> (<i>Their</i> , <i>Your</i>) <i>Midst</i>	132
LXIII. <i>Individual</i> for <i>Man</i> , etc.....	134
LXIV. <i>Ing-Forms</i> With and Without 's.....	136
LXV. <i>Jecopardize</i>	143
LXVI. <i>Journal</i>	144
LXVII. <i>Kine</i> for <i>Cows</i>	145
LXVIII. <i>Lengthy</i>	146
LXIX. <i>Lesser</i>	148
LXX. <i>Loan</i> as a Verb.....	150
LXXI. <i>Mathematics</i> —Singular or Plural?.....	152
LXXII. <i>Me</i> as a Quasi-Nominative.....	153
LXXIII. <i>Mechanics</i>	157

SECTION	PAGE
LXXIV. <i>Memorandums</i>	157
LXXV. <i>Metaphysics</i> — Singular or Plural?.....	159
LXXVI. <i>Mighty</i> as an Adverb.....	159
LXXVII. The Misplaced Relative Clause.....	162
LXXVIII. The Misrelated Participle (or Gerund).....	165
LXXIX. <i>Mutual Friend</i>	172
LXXX. <i>Myself</i> for <i>I</i> or <i>Me</i> , etc.....	175
LXXXI. <i>None</i> — Singular or Plural?.....	177
LXXXII. <i>Not Only</i> — <i>But (Also)</i>	181
LXXXIII. <i>Now</i> as a Conjunction.....	183
LXXXIV. <i>Of a Morning</i> , etc.....	185
LXXXV. <i>Only</i>	187
LXXXVI. <i>Onto</i>	193
LXXXVII. <i>Partially</i> for <i>Partly</i>	194
LXXXVIII. <i>Plenty</i> as Predicate Adjective.....	196
LXXXIX. The Pleonastic Pronoun.....	198
XC. <i>Politics</i> —Singular or Plural?.....	199
XCI. The Possessive Case of Inanimate Objects.....	202
XCII. The Possessive Case as Antecedent to a Relative Pro- noun	208
XCIH. <i>Pound</i> as a Plural.....	212
XCIV. The Preposition at the End of a Sentence.....	213
XCV. <i>Pretty</i> as an Adverb.....	217
XCVI. The Progressive Passive Verb Phrase.....	219
XCVII. <i>Proven</i> as a Participle.....	227
XCVIII. <i>Quit</i> = <i>Leave</i> , <i>Go Away from</i>	229
XCIX. <i>Reckon</i> and <i>Guess</i> in Literature.....	231
C. Redundant <i>That</i>	235
CI. The Relative <i>That</i> Before a Pause.....	236
CII. <i>Reliable</i>	239
CIII. <i>Remember of</i>	242
CIV. <i>Resurrect</i>	243
CV. The Retained Object.....	244
CVI. <i>Right</i> as an Adverb.....	249
CVII. <i>Save</i> and <i>Saving</i> + The Nominative Case.....	251
CVIII. <i>Scour</i> = <i>Search</i> , <i>Range over</i>	253
CIX. <i>Settle an Account</i>	255
CX. <i>Sick</i> and <i>Sickness</i>	255
CXI. The Singular Adjective as a Substantive.....	262
CXII. <i>Sit</i> or <i>Set</i>	264
CXIII. The Split Infinitive.....	266

SECTION	PAGE
CXIV.	Splitting Particles 272
CXV.	<i>Such</i> as an Adverb 275
CXVI.	<i>Such a One</i> and <i>Such an One</i> 276
CXVII.	The Superlative Used of <i>Two</i> 279
CXVIII.	Superlatives Irregularly Formed 281
CXIX.	<i>Suspect</i> = <i>Suppose</i> , <i>Imagine</i> 283
CXX.	<i>Sympathy With</i> (<i>For</i> , <i>In</i>) 284
CXXI.	<i>Talented</i> 286
CXXII.	Tense of the Infinitive 288
CXXIII.	<i>Than</i> as a Quasi-Preposition 291
CXXIV.	<i>That</i> as an Adverb 296
CXXV.	<i>That</i> as a Coördinating Relative 297
CXXVI.	<i>Thce</i> as a Quasi-Nominative 303
CXXVII.	<i>Think for</i> 305
CXXVIII.	<i>Thousand</i> for <i>A</i> or <i>the Thousand</i> 305
CXXIX.	<i>Thrived</i> or <i>Throve?</i> 306
CXXX.	<i>Thoroughly</i> 308
CXXXI.	<i>Tomorrow Is Sunday</i> 308
CXXXII.	<i>Try And</i> or <i>Try To?</i> 309
CXXXIII.	<i>Voice</i> as a Verb 310
CXXXIV.	<i>Was</i> for Subjunctive <i>Were</i> 311
CXXXV.	<i>What</i> Used of Persons 314
CXXXVI.	<i>Whether</i> as Interrogative Particle 315
CXXXVII.	<i>Who</i> for <i>Whom</i> 317
CXXXVIII.	<i>Whose</i> Referring to Neuter Antecedents 320
CXXXIX.	Words of Relationship 328
CXL.	<i>Yesternight</i> 329
CXLI.	<i>You Was</i> 331

I

INTRODUCTION

What is the standard of usage? What is good Greek? good Latin? good French? good English? For long centuries such questions as these have engaged some of the most acute intellects of the world and have been discussed—too often with great bitterness and venom.

Horace said, *usus et ius et norma loquendi*. One of his translators renders this, "Fashion . . . sole umpire, arbitress, and guide of speech." Instead of "fashion," which is rather ambiguous in modern English, let us rather say "usage." Usage, then, is the law and rule of speech. Horace says further:

Full many a word now lost—again shall rise,
And many a word shall droop which now we prize.

That is, words shall drop out of the language and revive again, and no two successive generations will use exactly the same vocabulary. This is as true today as in the era of Roman greatness. Now, whose usage is the norm of speech? Horace does not answer this question, but we cannot imagine for an instant that he took account of the great mass of ignorant or of half-educated Romans. He must have meant the usage of the intelligent, refined, cultivated classes; not of the "man in the street."

About a hundred years later the great Roman rhetorician Quintilian wrote his *Institutes of Oratory*, which we see quoted in our encyclopedias of the world's classics. In advising those who cultivate eloquence as to what kind of words to use, he says that the words which they use should have *consensus*

eruditorum, the consensus, agreement, of the cultivated (the learned, as some render it).

Vida, the great Italian critic, in his *Art of Poetry*, says:

If o'er the rest some mighty genius shines,
Mark the sweet charm and vigor of his lines;
As far as Phoebus and the heavenly powers
Smile on your labors, make his diction yours,
Your style by his authentic standard frame.

The unknown author of the famous *Art of Poesie*, published in 1589, says that "use and custome" are the "onely umpiers of speech." Not the "use and custome" of the unlettered mass; for he says in another passage that the best English was to be sought "in the Kings Court or in the good townes and cities within the land . . . the usuall speach of the Court, and that of London and the shires lying about London within LX miles, and not much above." This would indicate that the territory including London and the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge set the standard of speech for the whole English nation, no doubt because there were more educated and cultivated people in that part of England than in all the rest put together.

Ben Jonson, the poet, himself a scholar and a grammarian, said, "Custom is the most certain mistress of language, as the public stamp makes the current-money. . . . When I name custom, I understand not the vulgar custom . . . but that I call custom of speech, which is the consent of the learned." He is evidently quoting Quintilian, with whose *Institutes of Oratory* such a classical scholar was in that day necessarily familiar.

Three years after Jonson's death, Peacham, another critical scholar, writing on the subject of usage, refers to "those authors in prose who speake the best and purest English." He recommends to his readers seven more or less recent authors, five of whom are quoted today in the anthologies used in college classes and in our encyclopedias of choice literature.

In 1776, George Campbell published his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. This used to be a standard textbook in colleges and a book of reference for men of literary taste, and is still quoted in some of the best college rhetorics. Campbell says, "Language is purely a species of fashion. . . . Every tongue whatever is founded on use and custom,

Whose arbitrary sway
Words and the forms of language must obey."

These fashions, he says, may owe their existence to imitation, to reflection, to affectation, or to caprice. "Use, or the custom of speaking, is the sole original standard of conversation as far as regards the expression, and the custom of writing is the sole standard of style. . . . From the practice of those who have had a liberal education, and are therefore to be presumed to be best acquainted with men and things, we judge of the general use in language. . . . We must understand to be comprehended under general use whatever modes of speech are authorized by the writings of a great number, if not the majority, of celebrated authors. . . . The only certain, steady standard accessible to all consists in authors of reputation." He says that we cannot justify a locution because it is found in ancient authors: "No word not known to persons now living should be used. . . . The present use must be the standard of the present language. . . . Old words are proper if not obsolete, and a new word is not better because it is new. . . . The standard is a plurality of celebrated authors. . . . Usage is the sole mistress of language; grammar and criticism, her ministers. . . . Where usage is pretty evenly divided between two different though resembling modes of expression, either is proper. If the authorities preponderate on one side, it is in vain to oppose the prevailing usage. . . . Authority is everything in language."

Campbell did not take his examples from many living authors because their fame was not firmly enough established,

nor did he go farther back than about a hundred and twenty-five years except in the case of the King James Bible, which, he said, was in universal and continuous use as a standard of English.

Lord Chesterfield was a contemporary of Campbell's. His letters are often quoted in the encyclopedias of standard English. Speaking of faults in language he says, "He is unpardonable that has any at all, because it is his own fault; he need only attend to, observe, and imitate the best authors."

Dr. Hugh Blair, the famous lecturer on rhetoric in the University of Edinburgh, who died in 1800, says, "There is no standard, either of purity or of propriety, but the practice of the best writers and speakers in the country."

Thomas Jefferson, a man of remarkably scholarly tastes and, his whole life long, profoundly interested in education, writing to John Waldo, a grammarian of his day, said, "I have been pleased to see that in all cases you appeal to usage as the arbiter of language; and justly consider that as giving law to grammar, and not grammar to usage. I concur entirely with you in opposition to Purists, who would destroy all strength and beauty of style, by subjecting it to a rigorous compliance with their rules. . . . The example of good writers, the approbation of men of letters, the judgment of sound critics . . . would give it (visions of improving the language) a beginning."

In 1859 George P. Marsh, one of the pioneers of English studies in America, said, "Long usage, which is the highest of all linguistic authorities. . . . He who resolves to utter or write nothing which he cannot parse will find himself restricted to a beggarly diction."

In 1867, W. D. Whitney published his *Language and the Study of Language*. In this famous book, Whitney says, "The maxim, *usus norma loquendi*, usage is the rule of speech, is of supreme and uncontrolled validity in every part and parcel of every human tongue, and each individual can make

his fellows talk and write as he does just in proportion to the influence which they are disposed to concede to him. . . . The majority of good writers and speakers of English is the only authority which can make a word good English in the part of our tongue that we all alike use and value. . . . In any cultivated and lettered community, the cultivated speech, the language of letters, is the central point towards which all the rest, other than literary dialects or forms, gravitate, as they are broken up and lose their hold. . . . The speakers of language thus constitute a republic, or rather, a democracy, in which authority is conferred only by general suffrage and for due cause, and is exercised under constant supervision and control." Speaking of "English in the highest sense," he says, "It is that part of the aggregate which is supported by the usage of the majority; but of a majority made in great part by culture and education, not by numbers alone."

R. G. Latham (1812-1888), one of the most famous linguistic scholars of England, said that in language "whatever is, is right."

Against this body of distinguished writers, Richard Grant White, the American, a famous Shakespearean scholar, threw himself with indomitable vigor and vehemence in two books¹ on language. We shall state White's views briefly, so that the reader may see how he arrayed himself against all our authorities from Horace to Whitney. "The authority of general usage," he says, "or even of the usage of great writers, is not absolute in language. . . . There is a misuse of words which can be justified by no authority, however great, by no usage, however general." In these passages he rejects the long-accepted canon that good English is the English of reputable authors, provided they use language that is in general and present use. He continues: "Speech, the product of reason, tends more and more to conform itself to reason; and

¹ *Words and Their Uses* and *Every-day English*.

when grammar, which is the formulation of usage, is opposed to reason, there arises, sooner or later, a conflict between logic, or the law of reason, and grammar, the law of precedent, in which the former is always victorious. . . . As to words and the use of words, the standard is either reason, whose laws are absolute, or analogy, whose milder sway hinders anomalous, barbarous, and solecistic changes, and helps those which are in harmony with the genius of language. . . . Within certain limits usage has absolute authority in language. . . . It has been said that the usage which controls language is that of great writers and cultivated speakers. To a certain extent this is true; but it is not true without important qualification." White means that no array of great names can make us accept a word or a syntactical construction unless it can be shown that it is logical. With this as his war cry, he attacks some words and phrases of long standing in the language and, because he cannot parse the phrases or see the reasonableness of the words and the phrases, rejects them utterly. White shut his eyes to the fact that language is full of anomalies, of irregularities, that baffle both the etymologist and the grammarian. He ignored the fact that language is mightier than logic; that a hundred men use language all day long to every one man that can argue either logically or psychologically. Language often laughs at logic. As two of our recent writers on rhetoric¹ have well put it, "Usage is, after all, illogical and arbitrary; as Montaigne said, 'He who would fight custom with grammar is a fool.'"

Some writers besides White have stumbled at this point. Because a locution is what they call illogical, or contrary to reason, they denounce it as bad English. Take the locutions *all of us*, *all of them*, *both of us*. Though the writer has not watched these phrases very closely in the literature, he does not hesitate to say that they are used all over the English

¹ Herrick and Damon: *New Composition and Rhetoric*, edition of 1911, p. 241.

world by the best speakers and writers and by millions of educated people. Yet they are attacked by such a popular writer on words as Quackenbos,¹ the American; and the smaller textbook makers followed him because his books were used in many of the best schools and colleges. Dean Alford, the author of the *Queen's English*, defended these phrases in 1864 from the attacks of some English purists. Though the dean did not base his defense upon sound linguistic grounds, he was feeling out in the right direction. Now, the opponents of these phrases, Quackenbos among them, argue that it is correct to say *one of us, two of us, ten of us, some of us, fifty of us*, but absurd to say *both of us, all of us*, because "both" takes the two included in "us" and "all" takes everybody, while "of" is a partitive preposition; hence the phrases are illogical and therefore ungrammatical. These verbalists are either disciples of White or his linguistic fellows. They ignore two fundamental facts: (1) These phrases have been part and parcel of the best English for two or three hundred years. (2) They are formed according to analogy, which all the scholars, including White himself, recognize as one of the potent factors in the growth of language. Our forefathers had been saying *two of us, ten of us, some of us, many of us*, for untold centuries. Meantime they had been saying *we all, all we, they all, all they, we both*, and it was perfectly natural for them to extend the *of*-phrase so as to include these last-named groups; hence came *both of us, both of them, all of us, all of them*. These are all due to analogy, one of the potent forces of language, a force of whose existence Quackenbos would seem to have been entirely ignorant. Of this force, Richard Grant White knew something in a vague way; but he did not apply it in the case of numerous analogical forms which he attacked vehemently.

White, speaking of "the parents of language," includes "analogy, whose milder sway hinders anomalous, barbarous,

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, edition of 1896, p. 230.

solecistic changes.” This is a negative definition and unsatisfactory. Analogy is a positive force; it is defined by Professor O. F. Emerson¹ as “the tendency of the mind to bring regularity out of irregularity, similarity out of dissimilarity in the forms of words.”

Discussing the parents of language, White continues: “One parent of language must be precedent. . . . True and sound language is therefore the product of precedent and reason.” We have shown that reason is not one of the parents of all the words and phrases in language: the phrases *all of us*, etc., for instance, are analogical but not logical. Even precedent sometimes gives us the slip. Some words violate every tradition of language, are utterly abnormal and anomalous. Take the word *electrocute*, for instance. It is spreading among the people and bids fair to make a place for itself in good English. It is made up of the Greek *ηλεκτρο* (*electro*) and the ending of the Latin-English *exccute*. The people who use this word in conversation and the editors who use it in their columns do not stop to ask whether the word follows the precedents of word-formation; they use the word because they need it. It is the shortest way of saying “put to death in the electric chair.” The word is already recognized in some high quarters as good English. It defies all of White’s canons of usage; it comes under the canons of safer guides than White.

Having stated the views of Richard Grant White at considerable length and, as it is to be hoped, put the unwary reader on his guard against them, let us pass on to more trustworthy writers. If some one should ask why White is entitled to so much notice, the answer would be that his two books on usage are found where the volumes of Whitney and Lounsbury are almost unheard of.

In 1873, Fitzedward Hall,² the distinguished American scholar and authority, said, “By accepted usage in speech we

¹ *History of the English Language*, p. 264.

² *Modern English*, pp. 40, 41.

understand that which is practised, or approved, consentiently and advertently, by the best writers and speakers of any given time." He quotes Quintilian's *consensus cruditorum*, already cited in this section.

Quackenbos, whose books have had considerable influence, speaking of rhetorical rules (1896), says, "These laws are not the arbitrary inventions of a single mind, nor the expression of a single nation or epoch; they have been induced from a study of man's greatest literary efforts." "Reputable" he defines as "authorized by the majority of writers of high reputation."

Herrick and Damon,¹ in their revised *Rhetoric* of 1911, give George Campbell's canon of usage, "national, reputable, and present." "Reputable words," they say, "are those national and present words which are used by the body of speakers and writers of established reputation. . . . Nor is a word made reputable by being used by a few good authors here and there."

Lounsbury² says, "The standard of speech is the usage of the cultivated. . . . Clearly what Horace had in mind was the usage of the best writers and speakers. . . . It is the practice and consent of the great authors that determine correctness of speech. The pages of these are accessible to all. If they differ among themselves about details, choice is allowable until a general agreement settles in course of time upon one mode of expression as preferable to another or to any others proposed. . . . If a word or construction occurs in Cicero, the question of its propriety (for Latin) is settled at once. . . . The study of our best authors settles that [=any] point decisively. . . . Anything is good usage which is sanctioned by the usage of a large majority of speakers and writers, independent of the character of the individuals who make up that majority. . . . When we find an expression of any sort em-

¹ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 238.

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, chapter II.

ployed by a writer of the first rank, the assumption must always be that this particular expression is proper."¹

Greenough and Kittredge,² two distinguished American scholars, say, "No better standard can be found than the easy language of cultivated men who are neither specialists nor pedants." Speaking of the principles of propriety in language, they say, "Such principles are inferred, in the main, from the works of men of genius. . . . Usage must be limited in time. . . . Usage is the only standard in linguistic matters. . . . Usage is shifting; language never stands still." They pooh-poo the idea that a word has an original and essential meaning: it means just what it is intended by the speaker to mean and understood to mean by the hearer. A word, they say, is a mere conventional sign.

A very recent writer on usage is Professor George P. Krapp. In his *Modern English*³ he draws a distinction between "good English" and "standard English." The former he subdivides into three classes: popular English, colloquial English, and formal, or literary, English. All standard English, he says, is good English, but not all good English is standard. Good English is English that "hits the mark." We have good popular, or vulgar, English, good colloquial English, and good literary English.

The first objection to this treatment of the subject is his unprecedented use of "good." Ninety-nine persons in a hundred would never understand "good" as he uses it; we are accustomed to the phrase "good English" in a far different meaning. Again: we can hardly grasp the idea of "good vulgar English": the terms seem to the average mind absolutely incompatible.

A very serious objection to Professor Krapp's treatment of usage is that he seems to argue for a sort of isolated, neighbor-

¹ *The Standard of Usage in English*, chapter II.

² *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 122.

³ Pp. 325-334.

hood English. "English that hits the mark" in this or that community is, to him, good English. What, then, becomes of the *general* and reputable usage for which we have been striving and struggling? Shall every locality have its own *patois* or local lingo? Shall a person adopt the local peculiarities of every place he goes to or lives in? Take, for instance, the matter of pronunciation. If he calls for ham and eggs in New York on Sunday, shall he call for *'am and heggs* in London the next Saturday because the waiters will understand him? Or suppose he travels in America for a living. When he orders his breakfast in New York, should he say to the waiter, "*Wy* are these eggs cold? *Wen* were they boiled? *Were* did you cook them?" A few hours later, in Richmond, he changes to *why, when, and where*.

Once more: take a cultivated family moving from a center of refinement to certain new, less refined communities. Instead of "came," shall they say "come"? Instead of "ought not to have done that," shall they say "hadn't ought to do it"? Instead of "couldn't go," shall they say "couldn't get to go," and so on through the various corruptions used by the better classes of some of our communities? Is it possible that Professor Krapp really advises this?

The author has quoted nineteen writers on language. Of these, eighteen agree in the main. One, Richard Grant White, is arrayed against the others. Authority, say the eighteen, is the test. He says that no amount of authority counts for anything unless the word or the phrase is based upon precedent, reason, and analogy. This canon has been dissected in an earlier paragraph.

As to the authority in standard English, the eighteen men differ in no important details. They all agree substantially that "the man in the street" counts little in matters of usage; that educated, cultivated, learned men and women fix the standard of language. Some include celebrated speakers; but, since it is practically impossible to get any definite data as to

the English used by public speakers, since those speakers often use a free-and-easy colloquial English, and since many of their most finished addresses find their way into print, we may safely fall back upon the idea that all of our eighteen would be satisfied if we could base our opinions upon the usage of printed books "accessible to all," provided the authors come under the classes named by our authorities as makers and masters of language.

Let us go back to Greenough and Kittredge. They have already been quoted as saying that no better standard can be found than "the easy language of cultivated men who are neither specialists nor pedants." This sentence is pregnant with meaning. A specialist is apt to have "fad" words that he likes to air on occasion. A pedant is absolutely unreliable in matters of usage: he often "murders the King's English" in trying to save it. A cultivated, refined man of liberal culture not addicted to any specialty and not given to pedantry is apt to use easy and elegant language free from affectation and from priggishness. Such men will be quoted freely in the ensuing sections. They have written books in the past and are writing at present. Standard authors of national or of international fame, also, generally write with ease and spontaneity. They are not thinking about the language they use. Their minds are set upon the subject, the plot, the characters, the action, the psychology of their creations. Language with them is only incidental; with a pedant it is all in all; he measures his words, mouths his sentences, analyzes his phrases, bores his readers, can hardly talk for his words. Scott, the great "wizard," laughed at Lockhart, the wordmonger and verbalist. One is immortal; the other rarely mentioned in literature.

The writer would be willing to construe Greenough and Kittredge's word "language" as meaning spoken English also. Cultivated talkers, cultivated lawyers in their pleadings, cultivated preachers in their sermons—all of these help

us to realize the beauty of our language. Dean Alford in his *Queen's English* emphasizes the usage of "polite society"; but there might be some danger when we began to draw these social distinctions.

The present writer will quote a few scientific students of language like Whitney, Lounsbury, Earle, Bradley, and Skeat because they are not dry-as-dust specialists but eminent, not merely as scholars but also as men of liberal culture. We have all seen linguistic specialists whose English could not be quoted because it was so tainted with priggishness and self-consciousness.

In the ensuing sections, the author will take up a number of locutions at issue in our language, most of them burning questions in the best grammars and rhetorics. Evidence *pro* and *con* will be given, the opinions of the best grammars, rhetorics, and dictionaries cited, and the reader left to draw his own conclusions. In many cases the word or phrase will be traced through the literature for centuries. If valuable material is available in good books on language, it will be quoted freely, so as to bring the story of the locution up to date. One book that will be quoted very often is *The Standard of Usage in English* by the late Professor T. R. Lounsbury, whose name should be familiar to every student of words and usage.

About two hundred authors, either "reputable" or eminent, will be cited or quoted. Those who believe in the authority of a few supreme writers will find that these have been emphasized. Those who prefer to find their authority in a majority or a large number of reputable authors will no doubt be satisfied. The author of this volume does not believe in an oligarchy in language. He does not rest his conclusions exclusively upon the usage of Tennyson, Wordsworth, Macaulay, Dryden, Addison, Shakespeare, and a few others; he believes that the language is made not only by these but by stars of lesser magnitude, by men and women of culture and refinement who have contributed to literature in a less distinguished

degree, such as the editors of our best literary journals, prominent teachers, scholars, preachers—many of whom have a genius for idiom and are competent to criticize the great authors.

Most of the writers cited in this volume have considerable reputation. Some, as already said, are men of lesser note but thoroughly qualified to write pure, idiomatic English. In this day when many teachers are using some of the periodicals as models of style to be followed by their classes, it would seem eminently proper for a writer on usage to quote men and women of culture and education who, though not supreme authors, have won repute in the world of letters. The tables in this volume will show such men and women.

In the following pages, dicta from some of the most popular textbooks in rhetoric and grammar are quoted. The *pros* and *cons* are given impartially. These books are written by conscientious men who merit our thanks for the service they have rendered us. Sometimes we cannot accept their decisions, but we must respect them, rejecting them only when careful study of the literature shows them to be wrong. Only an exhaustive study of the literature can decide most of the questions raised by these writers.

Most of the great dictionaries, also, will be quoted *pro* and *con*. Compiled by staffs of editors, these works are valuable and indispensable. Each of them gives us the opinion of a committee of scholarly and conscientious men as to this or that locution. We may feel fairly safe when we find that we have the support of one or more of these great dictionaries. Until some laborious plodder can take time to ransack the literature, to see what authors are on this or that side, we accept the decision of such boards of editors and such collaborators as we see on the title pages of the best dictionaries. One criticism, however, we may venture. One fault we must find with most of these publications: they too often base their claim to public favor upon quantity rather than upon quality—upon

the number of words they admit, oftentimes upon very slight support from the usage of reputable authors. A more serious fault remains to be mentioned: in quoting from great authors they do not tell us whether the writer is speaking *in propria persona* or through some character who uses English far below the literary and cultivated level. This charge can be brought against some of the most famous of our dictionaries. In the present volume, this point will be carefully safeguarded.

The subject under discussion in the following pages is more complicated than it might seem to be: it is worth a whole man's whole thought. While we are writing our treatises, language is changing all around us; the volume published in 1915 may need revision in 1925. Personal feeling, environment, a hundred subtle causes, affect the student of usage, however conscientious. None of us can always be right: we are only seekers after the truth. The best of us will differ among ourselves: how good scholars differ will appear in the following pages. The best of them speak very modestly; only the sciolists are always certain.

One prime object of this volume is to show the continuous use of certain words and phrases in the literature. If a locution can be so traced from early periods down to recent or present days, there is every reason to regard it as good English. On the other hand, a new word or phrase, if found in enough standard writers, ought to be given a fair chance to spread through the language. The hostility to any particular word, if it supplies a real need, should not be encouraged.

The tables, or lists, in the ensuing pages are, of course, not exhaustive: they simply show how often the various locutions have been found in over 75,000 pages of English and American literature. If a statement such as "Found in 65 reputable authors 453 times" does not carry conviction to the reader, it might at least entitle the word to a fair chance and help to mitigate any attacks made upon it by purists and pedants. In matters of usage, there will very often be a margin of

uncertainty: the writer does not claim that he can positively establish a word, nor does he attempt to do so. This volume is historical rather than polemic.

A distinguished student of usage has said recently that only great authors like Tennyson, Macaulay, Dryden, Addison, and a few others should be put into the tables, or lists, used in this volume; that scholars like Whitney and authors like van Dyke should be mentioned in the footnotes. The writer has not adopted this policy. It would certainly seem that such men as these understand the idiom and the "genius" of the language well enough to be recognized in the body of the volume.

The passages quoted in the various sections of this volume will be taken largely from the greater authors, as they no doubt should be given special emphasis. No one open to conviction and no one looking for daylight will refuse to consider the usage of the supreme masters of language.

Another point that should be made clear is that the author of this volume relies mainly upon usage to establish a locution. When he shows that a word has either analogy or precedent or logic in its favor, these are distinctly subsidiary and subordinate: "custom is the most certain mistress of language." The only question is how much usage is required to give the word or phrase a place in standard English.

In the ensuing pages, naught will be "set down in malice." The author will not ally himself with those whom he regards as vehement verbalists. If banter is used, it will be good-natured and friendly. Scholars should never use the poisoned rapier; they should treat one another as fellow-laborers and as gentlemen; no Thersites should be admitted into their assembly.

II

ACCEPT OF

Which is standard, *to accept* or *to accept of* a thing? The second phrase is still heard occasionally in polite conversation and in public speaking, but is rare in recent literature. George Campbell in 1776 said that both *accept* and *accept of* were correct in his day, but that he preferred the former. Webster's International Dictionary quotes Milton as using *accept of*. The writer has seen it in the following authors:

Shakespeare	1	Addison	2
King James Bible.....	2	Goldsmith	1
Massinger	1	Franklin	1
Sir Thos. Browne.....	1	Richardson	1
Izaak Walton	1	Lamb	1
Milton	1	Milman	1
Congreve	1	Macaulay	1
Baxter	1	Lowell	1

The language is dropping the "of" from such phrases as *accept of*, *taste of*, but *admit of* is still literary.

Milman in his *History of the Jews* says, "to *accept of* equitable terms of peace." Macaulay in 1827 said, "The world would be in a wretched state indeed, if no person were to *accept of* power under a form of government which he thinks susceptible of improvement."

Accept with objective noun is the regular construction in standard authors, but the "of" form has some high authority from Shakespeare down to Milman, Macaulay, and James Russell Lowell.

III

ADJECTIVES NOT COMPARED

As to forms like *more perfect*, etc., the "lesser grammarians" are very rigid. Even the "greater grammarians" are inclined to be stricter than the famous writers. The schoolmasters rarely give us an inkling that such forms as *deadest*, *most perfect*, *most unique*, could be anything short of criminal. Even Bain¹ condemns forms like *chiefest*, *extremest*, *most perfect*. Carpenter² says, "Words like *perfect*, *complete*, *universal* can be compared only when used loosely." Under adjectives that cannot be compared, Nesfield³ names *perfect* and adds, "Such a phrase as *more perfect* is a short, but inaccurate, way of saying 'more nearly approaching perfection.' " If these greater grammarians are strict, what can be expected of the lesser?

Lounsbury⁴ is as usual very liberal. He says that the grammarians are often unjustifiably strict in regard to words like *perfect*, *supreme*, etc., and that these words have always been compared in all periods of English. He also cites *perfectior*, *perfectissimus*, from Cicero, to show that English is not peculiar in this matter. Kittredge agrees with Lounsbury.

The present writer has seen the following cases: *Chiefest*, seven times in the King James Bible; four times in Shakespeare; once each in Marlowe, Jeremy Taylor, Butler, Swift, Lamb, Emerson, Dean Trench, Phoebe Cary, Saintsbury, and Tennyson. *More perfect*, once in the Bible. *Most unique*, once in Dr. Henry van Dyke. *Most favorite*, once each in Dr. Johnson, Irving, and Professor William Minto. *Most principal*, once in the Prayer Book. *Very unanimous*, twice in Bishop Burnet. *Deadest*, once each in Emerson and Brown-

¹ *Higher English Grammar*, p. 149.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 105.

³ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 31.

⁴ *History of the English Language*, edition of 1907, p. 252.

ing. *Correctest*, once in Lamb. *Extremest*, twice in Congreve. *Most excellent* and *more excellent* are found in the Bible; the former certainly has wide vogue in polite society. *Very excellent* comes out prominently in one classic passage in the Prayer Book Psalter.

These examples should carry weight with all who recognize authority in language. Most of the authors quoted are eminent. Some are especially distinguished in the study of words. A few, though not of general fame, are literary men of a high order and well known to students of literature.

The writer does not advise the promiscuous use of the locutions under discussion, but is merely trying to show how the language is striving to throw off the shackles with which the lesser grammarians, the purists, and the pedants have long sought to bind it.

The lists above show that Lounsbury is right: these forms have been used all the way through the literature from Shakespeare—or Malory—to Henry van Dyke.

A few passages from the standard authors will be interesting.

Tennyson in *The Princess* says,

Our *chiefest* comfort is the little child
Of one unworthy mother.

In *The Song of Solomon* we read, "My beloved is the *chiefest* among ten thousand." Emerson in *The Poet* says, "The etymologist finds the *deadest* word to have been once a brilliant picture." In *Acts* 24:22, we read, "having *more perfect* knowledge of that way." In Saint Luke's Gospel we find, "*most excellent* Theophilus." In *Romans* 2:18, we have "things that are *more excellent*." In the Prayer Book Psalter, we read, "*Very excellent* things are spoken of thee, O Zion."

IV

ADVERBS USED AS ADJECTIVES

Kellner,¹ the Austrian scholar, says: "From its predicative position the adverb next proceeds to be used even as an attribute preceding the substantive. . . . The adverb preceding the noun is of recent date and is probably due to the influence of the Greek." He quotes from Middle English, the pre-Shakespearean drama, Pope, Byron, and Dickens, and also cites parallel cases from Latin and Greek.

Mätzner² characterizes these words as quasi-representative of the attribute. He cites examples from numerous authors of various periods.

Whitney,³ speaking of four of these words, *above*, *almost*, *sometime*, and *then*, says, "Sometimes (and less properly) even as an attributive adjective." but he uses *almost oblivion* in one of his own books.

E. A. Abbott⁴ says, "Some adverbs, especially those of place, are used with nouns almost like adjectives, except that they rarely come before the noun." He cites passages from Shakespeare, Byron, and Thackeray. He approves of *the above argument* and *the then world*. (See pages 31, 36, below.)

George P. Krapp⁵ recognizes these locutions and cites examples from Theodore Roosevelt and Cardinal Newman. Krapp treats *then*, *down*, and *outer*.

Baskervill and Sewell⁶ say, "By a convenient brevity, adverbs are sometimes used as adjectives." They cite passages from Shakespeare, the King James Bible, Ruskin, Trench, and

¹ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, pp. 31, 268.

² *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), III, 138, 139.

³ *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 171.

⁴ *How to Parse*, p. 241.

⁵ *Modern English*, p. 308.

⁶ *English Grammar*, p. 116.

Trollope that involve the words *then*, *sometime*, *seldom*, and *often*.

Jespersen,¹ in showing how free the English language is from pedantry and grammatical rigidity, speaks of "adverbs and prepositional suffixes used attributively," and illustrates by the phrases *his then residence* and *an almost reconciliation* used by Thackeray.

Nesfield² says, "the adverb that precedes the noun does not qualify the noun but some participle or adjective understood." For instance, "the *then* world" means the world then existing.

A. S. Hill,³ in his school Rhetoric, though not very partial to these loentions, admits that the *then* quoted above has established itself in the language; and he adds that *above* seems to be gaining ground.

Let us now take up some of these words *seriatim*.

1. ABOVE

This is condemned by Genung⁴ and Quackenbos⁵ in their textbooks. The Standard Dictionary does not recognize it. A. S. Hill is rather hostile, and gives an example to be corrected. He is inclined to criticize the New English Dictionary because, in defending *above* as an adjective, it quoted but one passage and that from a rather obscure author.

Dean Alford,⁶ on being criticized for using *above* as an adjective, said that, while not elegant, it was not uncommon.

Kellner⁷ recognizes *above* as an adjective and himself uses *the above instance*. The Century Dictionary says *above* has the force of an adjective in such phrases as "the *above* par-

¹ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 15.

² *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 89.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 290.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 301.

⁵ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 229.

⁶ *The Queen's English*, edition of 1866, p. 201.

⁷ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 268.

ticulars," in which "cited" or "mentioned" is understood. Webster and the New English Dictionary say that this word is often used elliptically as an adjective. Mätzner¹ cites *the above proverb* from Scott and *the above title* from Halliwell. The writer has seen *above* in Benjamin Franklin and in Hawthorne. The last-named author says *the above pictures* and *the above paragraph*; also, "It is not of pictures like *the above* that galleries, in Rome or elsewhere, are made up," etc.

2. AFTER

After is recognized as an adjective by the Century Dictionary; by the New English Dictionary, with numerous quotations from the literature; by the Standard Dictionary; by Webster, quoting Marshall. Baskervill and Sewell² recognize it, quoting De Quincey and Charles Kingsley.

The writer has seen *after moment* in Coleridge; *after years* in Jefferson; *after apostle* in Froude; *her after reputation* in Bulwer; *an after day* in T. N. Talfourd; *after lectures*, *after nation*, and *after language* in Trench; *after life* and *after career* in Herbert Spencer; *after life* twice in Sir Henry Taylor; *after times* in E. A. Freeman.

Froude uses *after* in his *Lives of the Saints*, "And again, when Patriek is described as the *after* apostle, raising the dead Celts to life," etc. Lamb, in his *Barbara S—*, says, "in the zenith of her *after* reputation it was a delightful sight," etc. Coleridge (*Essays and Lectures*) says, "He who possesses imagination enough to live with his forefathers, and, leaving comparative reflection for an *after* moment," etc., and, "nothing superior to them can be met with in the productions of his *after* years."

The large number of words like *aftermath*, now established in the language, proves that *after* was long used as an adjective

¹ *English Grammar* (Greece's translation), III, 138.

² *English Grammar*, p. 114.

and developed compounds. It was used as an adjective in the Anglo-Saxon period and has never lost this force entirely.

In composition we do not need *after* as an adjective as much as we do *above*; hence its comparative infrequency.

3. ALMOST

The use of *almost* as adjective is condemned by A. S. Hill,¹ Quackenbos,² and Genung³ in their textbooks.

It is recognized by the Standard and the New English dictionaries, the latter quoting Jeremy Collier, Southey, and W. D. Whitney. It is not recognized by Webster and the Century Dictionary. Baskervill and Sewell quote *the almost terror* from Thackeray, to show that an adverb may be used as an adjective.

The writer has seen *the almost tragedy* in Saintsbury; *the almost terror* in Thackeray; *the almost insanity* and *the almost impossibility* in Hawthorne; *the almost oblivion* and *the almost universality* in Whitney; *the almost diversity* in Coleridge; *the almost impossibility* in George Campbell; *their almost boyhood* in Sir Henry Taylor.

4. HITHER

Hither is treated as an adjective by Mätzner, who quotes *the hither side* from Milton. The Standard Dictionary recognizes it. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Motley and the *Century Magazine*. Webster recognizes it, with quotations from Milton, Tennyson, and Huxley. Even Richard Grant White says *the hither side*. The New English Dictionary recognizes *hither* as an adjective, quoting Milton, Merivale, Hawthorne, and John Earle. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting a passage from Lord Clarendon. The author has seen *hither bank* and *hither side* in Hawthorne.

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 290.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 220.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 303.

Tennyson says,

And on the *hither* side or so, she look'd
Of twenty summers.

5. OFTEN

Often is recognized as an adjective by Webster, with quotations from the Bible and from Beaumont and Fletcher. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Puttenham, Ben Jonson, Burton, and Tennyson. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting *I Timothy* 5, 23. Professor John Earle¹ quotes three early modern authorities that use it. The Standard Dictionary does not recognize it. The New English Dictionary calls it archaic, but quotes passages from Carlyle and W. D. Howells.

The writer has seen *often failings*, *often speech*, *often fears*, and *often prevailings* in Bacon; *often ejaculations* in Jeremy Taylor; *thine often infirmities* in the Bible; *the often changing of persons* in Sidney; *an often chance* in Tennyson. It occurs in Shakespeare, Tyndale, and Milton. The only case which the writer has seen in recent literature is the one quoted from Tennyson.

This use of *often* is little needed as we have "numerous" and "frequent." We rarely hear it in polite conversation, on the platform, or in the pulpit.

The most familiar passage involving this use of *often* is *I Timothy* 5, 23: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine *often infirmities*." Jeremy Taylor in *Holy Living* says, "so retire again with *often ejaculations* and acts of entertainment to your beloved guest." Tennyson in *Gareth and Lynette* says,

an *often chance*

In those brain-stunning shocks, and tourney-falls,
Frights to my heart.

The Oxford Dictionary is right in saying, "Now archaic."

¹ *Philology of the English Tongue*, edition of 1887, p. 214.

6. SELDOM

The New English Dictionary recognizes *seldom* as an adjective, quoting Tyndale, Jeremy Taylor, Lamb, and the *Pall Mall Gazette*. The Standard Dictionary recognizes it. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Shakespeare. Oliphant¹ says the word is used as an adjective in Yorkshire. Webster and the Century, however, call it archaic.

Tyndale uses it in his translation of the Bible. Shakespeare has *seldom state* and *seldom pleasures*; Jeremy Taylor, *seldom virtues*, *seldom anger*, and *seldom instances*. The writer has seen it as a predicate adjective in Richard Baxter.

The adjectival use of *seldom* is very rare in modern literature. We have "rare," "infrequent," and other words to convey its meaning, and *seldom* is almost confined to the adverbial use.

7. SOMETIME

Sometime as an adjective is recognized by Webster's International and the Century dictionaries, which quote passages from Purchas, Shakespeare, and T. N. Talfourd (died 1854). The Encyclopedic Dictionary quotes *my sometime general* from Shakespeare. The Standard does not recognize it as an adjective. Mätzner quotes two passages from Shakespeare. Baskervill and Sewell² treat it as an adjective, using the same passage from Shakespeare as the Century and Webster's International.

The phrase *sometime fellow* of such and such a university is still standard in England. Except in this connection, the locution is rare in recent English. The writer has seen no case in this course of reading, but scholars sometimes speak of themselves as *sometime professor in*, etc.

The most familiar passage involving this locution is

our *sometime* sister, now our queen. (*Hamlet* I. ii. 8.)

¹ *The New English*, I, p. 432.

² *English Grammar*, p. 116.

8. THEN

Then is the strongest of the group.

Kellner¹ treats it as an adjective, quoting passages from Byron and Dickens. Krapp² recognizes it, quoting Charles Dickens. A. S. Hill,³ who is generally rather strict, recognizes it. Mätzner puts it among his adverbs used as adjectives, citing passages from Bulwer and Byron. Baskervill and Sewell⁴ treat it in the same way, quoting Ruskin and Trollope. The Standard recognizes it as an adjective. Webster's International says: "*Then* is often used elliptically like an adjective for *then existing*; as, 'the *then* administration.' " Nesfield takes essentially the same view, saying, " 'The *then* king' = the then existing king." The Century Dictionary says that it is an ellipsis for "then being," quoting passages from Burke and Lamb. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting from Leslie Stephen and several minor writers.

However these scholars and dictionaries may explain its meaning, the locution is pretty strong in the literature and in polite society. The writer has recorded the following cases:

Ben Jonson	1	Southey	1
Dr. Johnson	1	Dickens	1
Boswell	1	Poe	2
Sharon Turner	2	Kingsley	2
Burke	5	Tennyson	1
Lamb	4	Aubrey de Vere.....	1
De Quincey	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1
Franklin	2	Huxley	1
Coleridge	2	Stevenson	1

The table shows a continuous use of this locution in England for three centuries but little popularity in America. Are the Americans more "schoolmastered" than the English? Or are the English more influenced by Greek than are the Americans?

¹ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 268.

² *Modern English*, p. 308.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 290.

⁴ *English Grammar*, p. 116.

This *then* is concise and convenient ; it saves time and economizes labor for the speaker. It is often usefully non-committal, *e.g.*, “The *then* president”—whose name I either do not remember or do not care to mention.

Who has not used this word in the hurry of speech?

Burke, whose figures are the largest in the table, says, “It was the letter of the noble lord upon the floor, and of all the king’s *then* ministers,” and “it was my fortune, unknowing and unknown to the *then* ministry.” (*Conciliation with America*.) Lamb in *Barbara S*— says, “whereat sat the *then* Treasurer of (what few of our readers may remember) the Old Bath Theater,” and “copied out in the rudest hand of the *then* prompter.” Poe (*The Case of M. Valdemar*) says, “make the experiment of mesmerizing him in his *then* condition.” De Quincey (*Autobiographical Sketches*) says, “All the world has heard that he was passionately devoted to the beautiful sister of the *then* Duke of Richmond.” Stevenson in *Merry Men* says, “I began to think of my *then* quest as of something sacrilegious in its nature.”

This use of *then*, we see, is pretty strong in the literature down to the present ; it cannot be called archaic. Nor can it, with such names behind it, be called vulgar. It has a better *raison d’être* than *often*, *after*, and others, for which the language furnishes adjectives exactly equivalent in meaning : *then* takes the place of a rather long group of words such as “who was then Duke of Richmond,” “the quest on which I was then engaged,” etc.

9. UNDER

Under is treated as an adjective by Webster, the Standard, Century, and the Encyclopedic dictionaries, and by Baskervill and Sewell,¹ the last-named quoting passages from Emerson and Ruskin.

The writer has seen it in Thackeray : *the under boy, the*

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 114.

under boys; also in Kingsley. It is used by Bulwer: *an under taste, the under butler* (twice). The Reverend Dr. C. Geikie uses it in his *Life of Christ*; Poe, in his *Tales*; Sir Henry Taylor, in his Autobiography.

The dictionaries give a large number of nouns like *under-current* and *underking*, which prove that *under* has always had adjectival value.

Kingsley in *Hereward* says, "with *under* copse of holly and hazel." Bulwer in *Pelham* says, "The *under* butler appeared"; "The *under* butler looked at him." "The *under* dog" is very familiar.

The foregoing facts and statistics make a strong case for the adjectival use of the words under discussion. While some of them have little vitality in recent literature, others are used considerably. As usual, the professors of rhetoric are more timid than either the linguistic scholars or the reputable authors.

Above and *then* are the most useful and "labor-saving" of the group; why will the purists compel us to use more words than we need to express our thoughts?

V

AFTER FOR AFTERWARDS

After, as an adverb, is used in England both in polite speech and in literature, but is rare in America. Abbott¹ notices it, quoting Shakespeare,

if you know
That I do fawn on men, and hug them hard,
And *after* scandal them.

Abbott adds, "Now we use *afterwards* in this sense, using *after* rarely as an adverb and only with verbs of motion, to

¹ *Shakespearian Grammar*, p. 36.

signify an interval of space, as 'he followed after.''' The writer has seen two cases in Shakespeare.

The use of *after* for *afterwards* runs through the literature for centuries. It occurs frequently in *Piers Plowman*; is found in Shakespeare, the Bible, the Prayer Book, Lodge, Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger, Milton, Lamb, Kingsley, Tennyson, Browning, and Justin McCarthy. It is very rare in American authors, the only case seen by the writer being in Professor L. A. Sherman's *Analytics of Literature*: "What race besides ever so buried a king, or *after* told the story so sublimely?"

This use of *after* is recognized by Webster, quoting the Bible; by the Century, quoting Shakespeare and the Bible; by the Encyclopedic Dictionary, quoting the Bible and Shakespeare; and by the New English Dictionary, quoting several authors.

Most of the dictionaries would lead one to infer that this use of *after* is not found in recent authors.

VI

ATHLETICS—SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

Is *athletics* singular or plural? A. S. Hill¹ says, "More frequently plural than singular," quoting a sentence involving the plural. Carpenter² says, "Regularly treated as plural." The New English Dictionary says, "Used in the plural on the analogy of mathematics," etc.

The writer has seen the word about twelve times in academic essays by Woodrow Wilson, A. C. Benson, Arlo Bates, and J. H. Canfield, all prominent in university circles. These scholars regularly use the plural except occasionally when a predicate noun in the singular leads the writer to prefer the

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 59.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 59.

singular verb; *e.g.*, Athletics is exhilarating sport. It would seem that the plural is almost universal in academic circles.

Professor Arlo Bates¹ says, "where *athletics* are carried so much farther." And "The feature which most markedly distinguishes modern *athletics* from those of the days of our fathers," etc.

Benson in his use of the plural probably represents the English university usage.

VII

AT LENGTH = AT LAST

Genung² condemned *at length* (= *at last*) in 1893 but later withdrew his opposition. The Century recognizes it. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it and quotes Dryden. Webster recognizes it. Lounsbury³ defends the locution. Though he does not cite any passages, he says, "No one who has made any study of the practice of the great writers in this particular can have failed to note that *at length* is employed by them five times in the sense of denoting the end of a period, where it is used once in denoting the full extent of anything. Either usage is of course correct." The opposition to the phrase was directed toward its use in the sense of "at last," denoting the end of a period, *i.e.*, "finally."

No doubt there are some besides Genung prejudiced against this phrase; for, judging by himself, the writer does not doubt that Genung's textbooks have influenced many people. The phrase in question is used by the following authorities:

Latimer	3	Samuel Daniel	1
Shakespeare	1	Marlowe	1
Massinger	1	Barnabe Barnes	1
Sidney	2	Beaumont and Fletcher.....	2
Ben Jonson	2	Milton	2

¹ *The Negative Side of Modern Athletics*.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, edition of 1893, p. 304.

³ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 165, 166.

Baxter	1	Mrs. Gaskell	7
Dryden	8	Bulwer	7
Swift	3	Thos. Hughes	2
Steele	3	Macaulay	98
Addison	13	Adelaide Procter	2
Pope	3	Newman	3
Prior	3	Hawthorne	6
George Campbell	1	D. G. Rossetti	1
Goldsmith	12	Mrs. Anna Jameson.....	1
Dr. Johnson	2	Browning	1
David Hume	1	F. W. Faber	1
Thos. Warton	1	Grote	17
R. B. Sheridan.....	1	Phoebe Cary	1
Fielding	51	Dean Trench	3
Gibbon	24	C. G. Rossetti	1
John Newton.....	1	Thackeray	4
Jefferson	4	Parkman	1
Franklin	21	Holmes	1
Sharon Turner	1	Tennyson	6
Wordsworth	14	Huxley	4
Thos. Campbell	1	J. A. Froude	1
Cowper	3	John Earle	14
Keats	2	G. W. Cable.....	18
Southey	3	Edward Dowden	1
Lamb	7	Longfellow	14
De Quincey	2	R. L. Stevenson.....	17
Scott	2	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
Hallam	7	John Fiske	8
Dickens	15	W. D. Whitney.....	4
Carlyle	13	Stephen Phillips	1
Poe	73	Ernest Rhys	1

Here are 72 "reputable authors" that use this phrase. It is pretty strong in Addison, Fielding, Goldsmith, Dickens, Carlyle, Stevenson, and John Earle, and very strong in Poe, Gibbon, and Macaulay; it is one of Macaulay's everyday expressions. If necessary, many more authors and hundreds of additional passages could be cited. If great names carry weight, the case of *at length* is settled in the affirmative. It is very common in polite speech.

To quote a few of the sentences in which this phrase occurs:

And long we gazed, but satiated *at length*
Came to the ruins. (Tennyson: *Princess*, Prol., ll. 90 ff.)

At length I saw a lady within call,
Still than chisell'd marble. (Tennyson: *Dream of Fair Women*, ll. 86 ff.)

at length

The expected letter from their kinsman came. (Wordsworth: *Michael*, ll. 306 ff.)

The ministers *at length* flattered themselves that Harley's resolution might be rescinded. (Macaulay: *Hist. of Eng.*, V, chap. xxiii.)

VIII

BEAT FOR DEFEAT

The first edition of Genung's *Outlines of Rhetoric*¹ warned the student not to say *beat*, but to say "defeat"; as, "Harvard defeated Yale in football." Though Genung changed this in a later edition, his first edition has no doubt influenced many students and teachers.

Beat is recognized by the Standard, Worcester's, Webster's, the Encyclopedie, and the Century dictionaries, with passages from Shakespeare, Arbuthnot, Prescott, and Matthew Arnold. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, with quotations from Caxton, the King James Bible, Malory, Pepys, Steele, Burke, Southey, Edgeworth, Byron, Hallam, Freeman, and Lowell.

The word occurs in the following:

Latimer	1	Franklin	1
King James Bible.....	3	Grote	1
Shakespeare	5	Mrs. Gaskell	1
Paston Letters	1	E. A. Poe.....	2
Addison	2	Macaulay	9
Dryden	1	Ruskin	1

¹ Edition of 1893, pp. 304, 305.

Thos. Hughes	2	Grant Allen	1
Freeman	12	H. N. Hudson	1
Holmes	1	Carlyle	1
Kingsley	4	Price Collier	1
Bulwer	1	Bret Harte	2

The writer has not seen *defeat* in the literature to any great extent, though no one would deny that it would be proper. In polite colloquial usage, *beat* is the usual word.

Macaulay says, "on which, right or wrong, he was sure to be *beaten*, and on which he could not be *beaten* without being degraded." The Bible (*Josh.* 8, 15) says, "And Joshua and all Israel made as if they were *beaten* before them, and fled by the way of the wilderness." Freeman (*Old English History*) says, "Theodosius, . . . who was a wise and brave man, and who *beat* both the Scots and the Saxons."

Freeman, as the table indicates, is very partial to this verb.

IX

BETWEEN EACH (OR EVERY)

A "common error" with persons of considerable intelligence is to say *between each* (or *every*) + the noun; e.g., *between each step*. This might seem to be illiterate; but it is found pretty often in the best authors. The writer has seen the following cases:

Shakespeare	1	Coleridge	1
Jeremy Taylor	1	Scott	1
Pope	1	Motley	1
Fielding	1	Dickens	2
Goldsmith	1	George Eliot	4
William Collins	1	P. H. Hayne	1

Scott says, "Between *every* pause." Motley says, "Between *each* step." The writer does not remember seeing *between every two steps*, *between every two pauses*, etc., in any great

author. George Eliot says, "Between *each* item", "between *every* section," and in *Adam Bede*, "pausing *between every sentence* to rap the floor" . . . "said Mr. Poyser, turning his head on one side in a dubitative manner, and giving a precautionary puff to his pipe *between each sentence*."

The writer is not recommending this locution but showing that it is not an unauthorized vulgarism.

X

BUT + NOMINATIVE¹

Whence all but *he* had fled. (Mrs. Hemans: *Casabianca*.)

Can a preposition take the nominative? Or is this *but* a conjunction? This is the point on which the grammarians differ; but the fact remains that sentences like that quoted above are found all through English literature. In the Anglo-Saxon gospels this construction is very common. It comes through Chaucer, Thomas Malory, the Miracle Plays, and Shakespeare, without a break to the present.

As to whether this *but* is a preposition or a conjunction, the grammarians differ. Mätzner² regards it as a preposition passed into a conjunction. Nesfield³ treats it as a confusion between conjunction and preposition. Abbott⁴ takes the same view, and says, "probably owing to confusion between the prepositional and the conjunctive usage, *but*, even when a preposition, is often followed by the subjective form." Bas-kervill and Sewell⁵ treat it as a preposition; Carpenter, as a conjunction. Kellner⁶ prefers to parse it as a conjunction.

The grammarians named above cite passages from the fol-

¹ For *save* + nominative see p. 251 below.

² *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), II, 467.

³ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 197.

⁴ *How to Parse*, p. 222.

⁵ *English Grammar*, pp. 283, 284.

⁶ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, pp. 130, 131.

following authorities: Anglo-Saxon Bible, Towneley Mysteries, Caxton, Shakespeare, Samuel Butler, Emerson, Kingsley, Southey, William Taylor, and Mrs. Hemans. The New English Dictionary under *but* says, "The colloquial use of 'me,' 'us,' for 'I,' 'we,' etc., as complementary nominatives in the pronouns, making it uncertain whether 'but' is to be taken as governing a case. . . . In colloquial use the objective forms are more common than 'I,' etc.; in literary use the point is usually avoided by some change of phraseology." Kellner¹ cites parallel passages from Lessing and Luther showing a like development in German.

The writer has recorded the following cases in English and American literature:

Lord Berners	1	Cowper	1
Malory	6	De Quincey	1
Chaucer	3	Jean Ingelow	1
Oocleve	1	Swinburne	3
Bible	3	D. G. Rossetti	6
Marlowe	7	Mrs. H. Ward	1
Shakespeare	15	Lowell	1
Milton	1	William Morris	2
Dryden	1	Browning	4
Pope	1	Bryant	1
Prior	1	Bayard Taylor	3
Addison	1	Mrs. Hemans	1
Boswell	1	Dickens	2
Philip Freneau	2	Newman	1
Hazlitt	1		

But I, but he, but she, but they, but we seem to be pretty evenly distributed.

To the average mind, even the educated mind, it is almost impossible to accept the dictum that a preposition can be followed by the nominative case; yet some of the best grammarians take this view. For instance, Baskervill and Sewell²

¹ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 269.

² *English Grammar*, p. 277.

say, "In the sentence, 'None remained but he,' grammatical rules would require *him* instead of 'he' after the preposition; yet the expression is sustained by good authority." Kellner, on the other hand, treats it as a conjunction in an elliptical construction, *e.g.*, "None remained but he" (remained). Others explain it in the same manner.

In parsing the *but*+nominative we are between the two horns of a dilemma. While, as already said, it is difficult to conceive of a preposition's taking any but an oblique case, we have a few parallel cases, *e.g.*, from Luther's Bible and Lessing, both cited by Kellner. To treat *but* as a conjunction often involves an absurdity; *e.g.*, "Whence all had fled but he had not fled." This is an ellipsis beyond the average comprehension, and we have no reason to believe that such a sentence ever had a place in the language. Some such locutions Abbott labels as due to confusion between two constructions, not attempting to parse them. Probably this is the best way out of this dilemma. While the grammarians are not able to solve the question of syntax, and though *but*+objective is more usual than *but* + nominative, we have nevertheless good authority for using *but* with a nominative pronoun.

In addition to the sentence quoted from Mrs. Hemans, we will quote passages from authors of even greater fame: "Within his own circle none durst tread but *he*." (De Quincey: *Lake Poets*, essay on Coleridge); "that being a vice which I think none but *he* who knows the secrets of men's hearts should pretend to discover in another," etc. (Addison: *Spectator*); "when the storm mounted overhead and broke upon the earth, it was those scorned and detested Galileans, and none but *they*, the men-haters and God-despisers, who . . ." (Newman: *Essays*.)

XI

CALCULATED + THE INFINITIVE

Whatever is *calculated* to affect the imagination. (*Burke.*)

Calculated + the infinitive, as in the quotation from Edmund Burke, was an abomination to Richard Grant White.¹ He found in the dictionary that etymologically *calculate* means to "compute, reckon, work out by figures," from *calculus*, a bean, used, in ancient times, for counting. So that, beguiled by "the devil of derivation," spoken of by one of our great scholars, he argued that we must not say "*calculated* to do harm" except where the thing was done intentionally. A more recent writer on usage, Professor J. F. Genung,² adopts the same idea. Genung says: "Not to be used in the sense of liable, likely, apt. . . . With the word is associated the idea of intent, and it should be used only in cases where this idea is present." The Century Dictionary takes practically the same position. The Hart textbook on rhetoric, written by the elder Hart and revised by his son, J. M. Hart, condemns *calculated* + the infinitive. Quaekenbos³ puts it in the class that he calls "malaprops," his word for improprieties in speech. White, in his attack upon the word, admitted that it was used by Goldsmith; for numerous other authors that use it, see the table below.

Calculated + the infinitive is recognized by Webster, with quotations from Goldsmith and Hawthorne; also, by the New English Dictionary, quoting Defoe, Southey, Gladstone, and two or three minor writers.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 96, 97.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 306.

³ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 152.

Thus far the authorities seem, on the whole, unfavorable: six *con*'s and two *pro*'s. Let us turn to the literature and see what reputable authors use it.

Addison	1	Hallam	5
Sheridan	1	Century Dictionary	1
Joseph Priestley	1	Ruskin	2
George Campbell	2	Fitzedward Hall	1
Coleridge	7	Motley	1
Gibbon	1	Poe	6
Grote	1	Bulwer	2
Irving	4	Justin McCarthy	2
John Adams	1	Dean Alford	1
Dr. Johnson	1	Holmes	1
Boswell	1	Milman	3
Swift	1	Horace Greeley	1
Defoe	1	W. D. Whitney	1
Dr. H. Blair	7	Mrs. Anna Jameson	4
Thomas Warton	3	George Eliot	1
Goldsmith	2	Minto	1
Thomas Paine	2	Douce	1
Burke	1	John Fiske	2
Hazlitt	1	Stanley	1
Lamb	3	W. W. Skeat	1
De Quincey	1	Matthew Arnold	1
Jane Austen	2	Gladstone	2
Jefferson	1	Huxley	2
Scott	2	Katharine Lee Bates	1
Mrs. Gaskell	1	Sidney Lee	1
Beaconsfield	2	Mrs. H. Ward	1
Trench	1	Saintsbury	1
Dickens	3	John Lubbock	1
Prescott	1	G. W. Cable	1
Carlyle	1	Sir Henry Taylor	3
Macaulay	2	Hawthorne	1
Charlotte Brontë	4	James Bryce	1

Here we have 64 authors in over 100 passages. Some of these authors are eminent writers on rhetoric; others are great stylists such as Burke, Arnold, and Macaulay.

White's denunciation of *calculated* terrified the present writer in days gone by; no doubt the new editions of his books

on usage are read by many people anxious to get daylight in matters of usage. While holding no brief for *calculated* + the infinitive, the writer feels that it is a very useful word and one that has been in good standing for at least two centuries. It has wide vogue in polite society and among reputable speakers. The dictionaries cited above and about sixty-five reputable authors would seem to establish the word as good English.

In addition to the passage from Burke already quoted, a few sentences from standard authors may be added. Gibbon says, "The grave simplicity of the philosopher was ill *calculated* to engage her wanton levity." Motley says, "previous statutes, which were, however, not *calculated* to make men oblivious." Matthew Arnold writes, "It seems *calculated* to be of more use." Ruskin says, "it . . . presents this group to the spectator in the form best *calculated* to enable him to grasp it also, and to grasp it with delight."

XII

CAN AS AN INDEPENDENT VERB

No doubt most of us lose sight of the fact that *can* sometimes holds on to its independent, or notional, meaning, so accustomed are we to its use as an auxiliary.

We are now treating *can* in the sense of *know*, *understand*, *know how to do*, *be able*, followed by an object. This use is recognized by the Century, with illustrative passages from older authors such as Chaucer, Shakespeare, Spenser, Ben Jonson, and Fletcher. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Milton and Pope. The writer can add the following: Milton (2); Matthew Arnold (1); Browning (1); Rossetti (1); Richard Crashaw (1); Emerson (1).

Of course, these are but sporadic survivals and are all found in poetry.

A few passages may be added for the benefit of any who might care to risk the locution. Browning says,

But here is the finger of God, a flash of the will that *can*.

Rossetti says,

She sobbed, "for we *can* no more!"

Matthew Arnold says,

Which has not taught weak wills how much they *can*?

In the older periods, this use of *can* was quite common; the following passage from Chaucer is one of many:

For in the lond ther nas no crafty man,
That geometrie or ars metrik *can*.

This article is merely a contribution to lexicography: the locution is not a disputed one but rare and interesting.

XIII

CATCH A POST (TRAIN, BOAT, ETC.)

Richard Grant White¹ and Genung,² the latter in 1893, condemned this locution, but Genung afterwards withdrew his objection. It is recognized by Webster, the Century, the New English, the Standard, and the Encyclopedic dictionaries, most of them using the phrases at the head of this section.

"To reach, to arrive at," is an old meaning of *catch*, and is found in English literature for many centuries. White argued that we could catch a person on the train or catch scarlet fever from some person who had been in the train, but could not catch the train. He overlooked one of the old meanings of the word and thought of only one meaning.

Polite usage favors the locution. The scholars first named are in the minority.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, p. 99.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1893, p. 306.

XIV

CATCHED FOR CAUGHT

Lounsbury¹ says, "During the whole period of modern English *catched* and *teached*, which go back to the Old English period, have maintained themselves alongside of *caught* and *taught*, though the present tendency is to regard them as improper."

The Century Dictionary says they are vulgar or obsolete. Webster recognizes them as secondary but rarely used forms.

The writer has seen the following cases: Shakespeare (1); Lyly (1); Butler (1); Defoe (1); Congreve (1); Boswell (4); Dr. Johnson (1); Lamb (1); Dr. H. Blair (2). Dr. Johnson defended *catched* and used it himself. Horace Walpole used it. Fitzedward Hall in 1873 called it "vulgar and ignorant." Lamb is the most recent author in whose books *catched* was seen, and he is somewhat old-fashioned in his grammar, as will be seen in several sections of this treatise. In a letter dated December 27, 1800, Lamb says, "Then he caught at a proof-sheet, and *catched* up a laundress's bill instead." This may be humor. Webster is undoubtedly correct in saying "rare." The writer has found so few modern writers using *catched*, and hears it so often in the mouths of the illiterate, that he cannot accept Lounsbury's statement that *catched* has maintained itself through the whole period of modern English unless he will say "sporadically," or "as a vulgarism." Butler's one case is a participle; the others, mostly preterites.

¹ *History of the English Language*, p. 385.

XV

COLLECT A BILL

Genung¹ condemned the phrase *collect a bill* in 1893 but afterwards withdrew his objection. Others, however, possibly influenced by him, are still fighting the locution, arguing that one can collect the money but not the bill.

The Century, Standard, and Webster recognize the phrase.

Polite usage accepts the locution; how else shall we express the idea?

XVI

COMMENCE + THE INFINITIVE

Genung² condemns (but mildly) the use of *commence* followed by the infinitive, as "He commenced *to play*." He thinks "begin" is better with the infinitive; *commence*, with the form in -ing; e.g., "He commenced *playing*," but "He began *to play*." The Century takes the same view. Webster says that good writers prefer the verbal noun after *commence*. George P. Marsh, in his *Lectures on the English Language*, takes the same view but says that there is no valid grammatical objection to the infinitive after *commence*.

The phrases *commence patriot*, *commence author*, etc., though condemned severely by White, have been used in England by such writers as Junius, I. D'Israeli, and Fitzedward Hall, and the phrases *to commence M. A.*, etc., have been recognized for at least three centuries in England. They are not found to any extent in American literature.

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1893, p. 307.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 307.

XVII

CONCORD OF VERB AND SUBJECT

“A verb *must* agree with its subject in number and person” is an old rule of grammar that we have all learned at school. In our young days we never dreamed that this rule ever admitted an exception. No teacher, no grammar, ever suggested such a possibility. In recent years, however, we read in progressive textbooks that a verb may decline to agree with its subject. We are told that a group of subjects may be conceived as a unit and take a verb in the singular. In one standard grammar for high schools¹ we are told, “It will not do to state as a general rule that the verb agrees with its subject in person and number.”

In the Anglo-Saxon period we see plural subjects taking the singular verb. Groups of cases are given by March and by Mätzner in their grammars; the writer has recorded four unmistakable cases in *Beowulf*. These Anglo-Saxon sentences cannot be represented in modern English on account of the loss of inflections. But they are real incongruences just as if we should say, “Two men *goes* to the city;” “James and John *sees* the sights.” They are rare but prove that the rule was not absolutely rigid.

Those who have studied Greek will remember the neuter plural subject: if a noun is neuter, its nominative plural takes a singular verb. However scholars may explain this, it proves that the Greek language did not require every plural subject to have a plural verb. The Anglo-Saxon language, also, allowed this occasionally: the writer has recorded one case in King Alfred’s *Orosius* and one in the poetry of Caedmon, though editors, not knowing of the neuter plural and singular verb, have emended this last word into a plural. Kühner, in

¹ Baskervill and Sewell, p. 312.

his Greek Grammar,¹ tells us that, occasionally in poetry and very rarely in prose, masculine and feminine plural subjects take the verb in the singular.

Jespersen² tells us that the spoken language of Denmark discarded concord in verbs three hundred years ago and the written language more recently, so that the verb no longer carries a sign of person and number. Bradley, the English lexicographer, intimates that English may some day do the same thing; *c.g.*, *He go, she go*, etc. That is, the pronoun alone will show person and number. Jespersen would no doubt place this under "progress in language"; but the purists would say that the English language was going to perdition.

In Chaucer's *Squire's Tale*³ we read,

The spyces and the wyn (wine) *is* come anon.

Skeat⁴ in one of his glossaries says of this *is*, "Present singular used with two substantives." Mandeville says, "there *is* made large nets," etc. Malory says, "*was* chosen . . . the most men of worship." These are typical of numerous passages in Malory, Latimer, Marlowe, Shakespeare, and many Elizabethan authors. The great grammarians all note that *is* and *was* are used with plural subjects for many centuries, especially when they stand before the subject. "There *is* tears for his love"; "here *is* more of us"; "fire and food *is* ready," are typical for Shakespeare. "Two or three *is* enough to bear witness"; "so *is* the pains of the soul"; "where *is* locked up all things necessary," etc.; "which doings of the vicar *was* damnable"; "*was* there not some," etc.?—these are taken here and there from Latimer's sermons. Lounsbury, however, regards this *is* and *was* in Elizabethan literature as plural, and to them traces the illiterate *is* and

¹ § 241.

² *Progress in Language*, pp. 32, 33.

³ L. 294.

⁴ *Prioresses Tale*, etc., Clarendon Press, s.v.*is*.

was in present-day English. Mätzner, also, treats *was* as an old plural in *you was*.

This *is* and *was* come on down. Pepys says, "here *was* W. Batelier and his sister," etc. Cowley says, "there *was* wont to lie Spencer's works." Hume writes, "The principles of every passion, and of every sentiment, *is* in every man." Mary Wortley Montagu says, "There *is* few of my acquaintance I should ever wish to see again." Charles Lamb: "There *was* only he and Lewis"; "there *is* in nature, I fear, too many tendencies," etc.; "here *is* more of the plaguy comforts," etc. As the foregoing examples indicate, this construction is especially common after "here" and "there" at the head of the sentence. This is paralleled in Greek and is treated as impersonal by the grammarians.

Thackeray writes, "There *was* a hare, a rabbit, some pigeons," etc. This construction is sometimes explained by saying that, when uttering the verb, the writer or speaker had not conceived the subject clearly in his mind and that consequently he used the singular verb most naturally. However we may explain these cases, the fact is clear that the plural subject does not always require the plural verb in standard literature: the syntax used to be freer before it was "schoolmastered."

Baskervill and Sewell¹ quote sentences like those given above from Matthew Arnold, Burke, Hawthorne, and Scott. They quote from Macaulay, "Then *comes* the 'Why, sir!'" and the "What then, sir?" and the "No, sir!" putting *comes* under the head of "several subjects with a singular verb when the subjects are after the verb." Our present strict syntax would lead us to criticize all the sentences quoted above if found in the writings of an unknown author. Young says, "What *means* these questions?" What schoolmastered writer of our day would risk that sentence?

Again: Malory writes, "Manhood and worship (*i.e.*, honor)

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 314.

is hyd within man's person"; "worship and hardynesse is not in arayment." The King James Bible has "Light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee"; "where envying and strife is." Milton says, "The weight of all, and our last hope, *relics*." Thackeray says, "In those two gentlemen is the moral and exemplification of," etc. In all these sentences, where strict modern usage demands the plural, grammarians explain the singular verb by saying that the two or three subjects constitute a psychological unit and may therefore have a singular predicate. Or *relics* in the sentence from Milton might agree in number with *hope* as being the subject nearest the verb and uppermost in the mind of the writer. In either case, it helps to justify the statement of the greater grammarians that a plurality of subjects does not always require a plural predicate. Kellner¹ well puts it, "Every plurality may be conceived as a unity." That is good, strong food for the liberal scholars; how can the purists ever swallow and digest it?

This dictum of Kellner's is well illustrated by sentences that the writer has recorded in his notes. John Knox says, "Both my vocation and conscience *craves* plainness of me." Here the idea is a unit: "my duty as a minister and my conscience" may be taken together as one idea. We might, however, treat *craves* as the old Northern plural so common in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and edited out of the plays of Shakespeare wherever possible. This, however, will not apply to Thackeray's sentence, "That dining for a shilling and strutting about Pall Mall afterwards *was*, after all, an hypocrisy." The plurality here can be conceived as a unity—"that pretense, that deception, trying to hide your impecuniousness by strutting around Pall Mall after eating a wretched dinner in a cheap tavern, *was* an hypocrisy." So Thackeray no doubt conceived it when he wrote the sentence, though it

¹ See *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, §§ 84 ff., for a thorough treatment of this subject.

may be possible that *was* takes its number from "hypocrisy." Wordsworth writes: "But here *is* perfect joy and pride." This would bring down the scorn of the puristic grammarian.

Numerals, being apprehended as a collective unit, sometimes take the singular; *e.g.*, "Seven masters *is* here come"—modernized from a monument of about A.D. 1320.

We have left Shakespeare to the last. In spite of the editors of three centuries, there are passages in Shakespeare's plays that look ungrammatical to the readers of our day; *e.g.*, "Banquo and his Fleance *lives*"; "hanging and wiving *goes* by destiny"; "whose own hard dealings *teaches* them suspect," etc. So in the sonnets, the rhymes have saved many verbs from being altered by the editors; *e.g.*, "Both truth and beauty on my love *depends*."

In a note to the *teaches* quoted above, Richard Grant White says, "A fine example of Shakespeare's heedlessness of grammar." Some other literary scholars, commenting on some of these two hundred or more passages changed by editors say, "Singular verb with plural subject." Dr. E. A. Abbott and other grammarians, however, regard these as old Northern plurals surviving down through the Elizabethan period. This explains "Kind nature and custom *gives*," in *Gorboduc*; numerous passages in Latimer; at least two hundred in unaltered editions of Shakespeare, and many passages in other Elizabethan literature. When, however, we see these same incongruences in authors like Cowley, Milton, Hume, Lamb, Thackeray, and others, we must ascribe them to the freer syntax they were working under. Lamb, especially, was a free lance in English: he, as seen in other sections of this treatise, occasionally used *you was* and two negatives, both of which were in disrepute in many quarters when he used them.

Defoe is called very ungrammatical by one of the most eminent literary critics of the last century. No doubt this critic and rhetorician judged Defoe by some of these old plu-

als that survived through his day (1661-1731) and longer. We have noted some of the passages: "In which *was* embarked all my effects in the world"; "there *was* but twenty-eight in the whole city"; "numbers of people which . . . had flocked to London . . . *was* such," etc. In a note to one of these passages, a distinguished American scholar says, "Defoe does not always observe grammatical correctness." But, applying the canons of syntax as quoted from Mätzner, Kellner, and other great grammarians, we find that they all come under these canons; which means that Defoe used the English language according to the free syntax in vogue before the eighteenth century reformers and their nineteenth century disciples had improved the language, rewritten Shakespeare, and put us all in strait-jackets.

One famous passage from the heart of the living language may well be quoted. In his great *Recessional* hymn, Kipling says,

The tumult and the shouting *dies*,

where most of us would use *die* in both spoken and written English. Some one, not willing to be convinced, may say that Kipling wanted a rhyme for "sacrifice."

XVIII

CONSIDER FOR REGARD

Some objection has been raised to the word *consider* in the sense of regard; *e.g.*, "He is *considered* an able man." It is recognized by the Century, which quotes Newman and J. R. Seeley. Webster's International Dictionary recognizes it with a passage from Macaulay. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Lord Berners, Marryat, James Bryce, and

Andrew Lang. The Standard and the Encyclopedic dictionaries recognize it. Genung condemned it in 1893.

The writer has seen it in the following:

Addison	20	Holmes	5
Steele	3	Hawthorne	1
Fielding	22	Thomas Hughes	1
Goldsmith	1	Grote	19
Hume	4	Macaulay	36
Franklin	3	Carlyle	3
Gibbon	28	Sir Henry Taylor	1
Lamb	5	Stevenson	1
Hallam	32	Sir Leslie Stephen	1
Poe	1	George Eliot	2

This shows an unbroken history from Addison to Stevenson.

Richard Grant White¹ (1867) ridiculed this use of *consider*. He thought that *consider* was derived from the Latin for "sit down together" and should be held to its etymology. So he ridiculed the idea of its being used in the meaning of "think", "suppose," and thought it should be used in the sense of "ponder", "contemplate." According to White and his school, a word cannot cut loose from its etymology and expand its territory: *consider* would have to mean "sit down together." Or, if it should be traced back to the word *sidera* (stars), we should have to take counsel with the stars before forming an opinion. All which is utterly opposed to recent scholarship and modern philology.

The lists given above show that *consider* in the meaning of "regard" has been in good standing for hundreds of years. Genung withdrew his objection in 1900, but White's attacks are still found in our libraries in new editions of his books. Moreover, Genung's earlier editions are still on many bookshelves.

Stevenson says, "I *considered* this one of the most unhand-some speeches ever made." Gibbon says, "The conquest of

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 101, 102.

Britain was *considered* as already achieved." Addison says, "She *considers* her husband as her steward"; "Cowley, observing the cold reserve of his mistress's eyes, . . . *considers* them as burning-glasses producing love." (*Spectator*.)

XIX

CONSPIRE = CONCUR, AGREE

From its association with *conspiracy*, one might think that *conspire* would always have an unpleasant connotation. This, however, is not the case. It is recognized in an entirely pleasant meaning by the Century, Webster, Standard, and Encyclopedic dictionaries, which quote Goldsmith, Cowper, Emerson, and Tyndall.

The word is used in a pleasant sense by the following:

Spenser	1	Coleridge	1
John Evelyn	2	Grote	1
Dryden	1	Hallam	3
Congreve	1	Sir E. Strachey	1
Joseph Hall	1	Poe	1
Addison	1	E. A. Abbott	1
Pope	3	Prescott	1
Dr. H. Blair	1	William Minto	1
Goldsmith	4	George Eliot	1
Philip Freneau	1	Bulwer	1
De Quincey	1	Stevenson	1
Shelley	1	H. W. Mabie	1

Here are 27 reputable authors using the word in its pleasant meaning and 4 dictionaries recognizing it.

De Quincey, in his *Lake Poets*, says of Coleridge, "all things *conspired* (=combined) to throw back my thoughts upon that extraordinary man whom I had just quitted." Stevenson says, "the steepness of the slope, the continual agile turning of the line of descent, and the old unwearied hope of finding something new in a new country, all *conspired* to lend

me wings." (*Travels with a Donkey.*) Prescott in his essay on Sir Walter Scott says, "It is impossible to glance at Scott's early life without perceiving how powerfully all its circumstances . . . *conspired* to train him for the peculiar position he was destined to occupy in the world of letters."

Conspire in the meaning of "combine," with no unpleasant connotation, is found in English literature from Spenser to Stevenson. The pleasant use of the word is not disputed in the books, though the writer long had doubts as to its propriety.

XX

CONSTANT(LY) = CONTINUAL(LY)

Genung in his high school Rhetoric¹ says, "*Constantly*, which means 'steadfastly,' not to be used for 'often' or 'continually.' " Mr. Genung himself, however, uses *constantly* in this sense at least ten times in his books, and it is probable that thirty or forty cases could be found, showing that his theory is stricter than his practice.

The Century Dictionary recognizes *constantly* in the sense of "continually." The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Macaulay. The Oxford Dictionary recognizes it, quoting reputable authors. It is probable that hundreds of cases could be found in Macaulay: the list below shows 94 passages.

The word occurs continually in every author worth quoting: the writer has recorded the following passages:

Bacon	1	Franklin	7
Baxter	3	Johnson	3
Addison	1	Goldsmith	1
Pope	5	Burke	1
Swift	1	George Campbell	2
Steele	2	Hume	4
Fielding	21	Gibbon	10

¹ Appendix III, p. 308.

Hazlitt	1	H. H. Furness	1
Jeffrey	1	O. F. Emerson	1
Jefferson	3	Henry Bradley	1
Lamb	9	Grant Allen	3
Hallam	19	Justin McCarthy	1
Southey	2	G. W. Cable.....	1
Grote	16	Professor John Earle.....	4
Keats	1	Dr. C. Geikie	1
Trench	7	Henry Sweet	1
Mrs. Anna Jameson.....	1	Saintsbury	2
Mrs. Gaskell	1	Huxley	6
Dean Alford	2	H. A. Beers.....	1
Holmes	4	Genung	10
Dickens	4	T. N. Page	3
George Eliot	7	Lounsbury	43
Bulwer	7	Sidney Lee	1
Matthew Arnold	2	Kittredge and Greenough.....	10
Maeaulay	94	W. W. Skeat	2
Hawthorne	2	Stevenson	6
E. A. Freeman	1	Longfellow	1
Thomas Hughes	3	Arlo Bates	3
W. D. Whitney	32	James Bryce	2

Here we have about 58 authors and about 385 passages; many others could be added. As seen from a glance at the table, *constantly* is a favorite word with Macaulay, Whitney, and Professor Lounsbury—a great stylist and two great English scholars. If one authority can establish a word, Macaulay certainly establishes the word under discussion. Notice the faithful custodians of language in the list: Alford, A. S. Hill, Trench, Whitney, Genung, Kittredge, and Lounsbury. Polite colloquial English and the most finished speakers regularly employ *constant* and *constantly*.

The meaning "continual" is a perfectly natural extension of the original meaning of *constant*; e.g., "A constant (steadfast) friend becomes a constant (frequent) visitor."

Macaulay (*History of England*, I, chap. III) says, "It is, in some sense, unreasonable and ungrateful in us to be *constantly* discontented with a condition which is *constantly* improving.

But, in truth, there is a *constant* improvement precisely because there is *constant* discontent." Stevenson says, "the fear of the sea was *constantly* in my mind, battling with the fear of my companions." (*Master of Ballantrae*.) "They were then *constantly* together." (*Master of Ballantrae*.) Steele says, "His faults are generally overlooked by all his acquaintance; and a certain carelessness, that *constantly* attends all his actions, carries him on with greater success. . . ." (*Spectator*.)

XXI

CÔTEMPORARY = CONTEMPORARY

The great scholar Bentley (1662-1742) denounced *cotemporary* as a "downright barbarism." For some time it expelled *contemporary*, but has now been beaten in the race. George Campbell in 1776 expressed his preference for the form in *con*. *Cotemporary* was on the forbidden list of W. C. Bryant, the very critical editor of the *Evening Post*. It is condemned by Genung¹ in his school Rhetoric. The Century says that it is the less usual form. It is recognized as proper by the Standard, the New English, Webster, Worcester, and the Encyclopedic dictionaries, the last-named quoting Locke and Sprat as using it.

The writer has seen the word once in Hazlitt, three times in Christopher North, twice in Dean Trench, once in Poe.

It is undoubtedly less common in recent literature than the other word, but should not be condemned as an error. There seems no ground of objection to the form in *co*; it is just now out of fashion but may come into vogue at some later period.

Christopher North in an essay says: "Go back a little, step over an imperceptible line, to the *cotemporary* of Dryden,

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 308.

Milton, and you seem to have overleaped some great chronological boundary"; "Shakespeare and Spenser, what *cotemporaries!*"; "In the verses of our old poet and his *cotemporaries*, Venus and Cupid are as active as they were with Homer and Anaereon." Since the days of North, *contemporary* has become the regular form.

XXII

A COUPLE OF FOR TWO

The phrase *a couple of for two* was attacked vigorously by Richard Grant White¹ in 1867. Quackenbos² in various editions of his textbooks continued the attack. Genung³ in his first edition condemned the phrase, but withdrew his opposition after "he had taken account of criticism and comment." Unfortunately, however, a scholar like Genung can never undo the harm that he does an innocent word or phrase.

The phrase is recognized by the Century, quoting Sidney, the Bible, Shakespeare, Pepys, Loeki; by Webster, quoting Sidney, the Bible, Addison, Dickens, and Carlyle; by the New English Dictionary, quoting Caxton, Coverdale, Ascham, Shakespeare, Steele, and others not so eminent. The writer has seen it in the following:

Interludo of Thersytes.....	1	Coleridge	1
Latimer	1	Hazlitt	1
King James Bible.....	2	Philip Freneau	1
Addison	8	Jane Austen	2
Dean Swift	1	Scott	2
Sterne	3	Lockhart	2
Boswell	1	Christopher North	1
Dr. Johnson	1	De Quincey	2
Smollett	1	Poe	10

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 102, 103.

² See *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 232.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1893, p. 308; 1900, pp. 301, 308.

Holmes	1	Matthew Arnold	1
Mrs. Gaskell	1	Mrs. Anna Jameson.....	1
Dr. John Brown.....	1	George Meredith.....	10
Bulwer	2	Professor John Earle.....	1
George Eliot	21	Mrs. H. Ward.....	4
Huxley	1	Stevenson	12
Dickens	31	Henry James	1
Thackeray	38	Saintsbury	3
Ruskin	1	Kipling	1
Froude	1	George P. Marsh.....	1
W. E. Henley.....	2	John Fiske	7
D. G. Mitchell	4	W. D. Whitney.....	2
Browning	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1

Here are about 50 authors in more than 175 passages.

It is pretty common in polite society but still more popular with the uneducated classes. A good many people think that a word popular with the uneducated classes is apt to be wrong, but this is not a safe inference. Of course it is true that much of their grammar and of their vocabulary is broken down aristocracy, but not all of it.

The phrase under discussion has a long and honorable pedigree. How it is used by some eminent writers of different periods will be seen from the following passages. Addison in the *Spectator* says, "As we were upon the road, Will Wimble joined *a couple of* plain men who rid before us." Coleridge says, "If people would, in idea, throw themselves back *a couple of* centuries." Ruskin says, "A great nation, for instance, does not spend its entire national wits for *a couple of* months in weighing evidence of a single ruffian's having done a single murder; and for *a couple of* years see its own children murder each other," etc. Matthew Arnold (*Religious Sentiment*) says, "*A couple of* Syracusan women, staying at Alexandria, agreed on the occasion of a great religious solemnity," etc. This phrase ran riot in the volumes of Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot, but is not so common in recent literature, though Stevenson was partial to it. The attacks of White and other verbalists may have influenced the

destinies of this locution in the literature. The phrase occurs in many excellent books by men of scholarship not in the table given above.

XXIII

CULTURED AS ADJECTIVE

Of *cultured* as an adjective, A. S. Hill¹ said, "At present it has no standing in literature or in polite society." Genung² said, about the same time, "Though somewhat undesirable in formation, is in too common usage to be condemned." When such good doctors disagree, what shall we poor patients do? Nothing but go to the higher authorities, the reputable authors, and the "easy language of cultivated men who are neither specialists nor pedants."

Before citing the authors, let us see what the dictionaries say. The Century recognizes *cultured*, quoting Izaak Taylor. Webster recognizes it, quoting the same passage from Taylor and one from Whittier. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, and quotes Goldsmith, Tyndall, and Whittier. The Encyclopedie Dictionary recognizes it, quoting a passage from Cowper. These facts seem to refute Hill's statement. The writer has seen the word in the following:

W. D. Whitney	2	Richard Grant White.....	2
Fitzedward Hall	1	Walter Bagehot	2
John Earle	2	J. F. Genung	6
Herbert Spencer	1	Bishop Moule	2
Huxley	1	G. K. Chesterton	1
William Hayes Ward.....	1	Henry Drummond	1
Frederic Harrison	2	Edward Dowden	1

As most of these men were writing in 1902, Hill's statement was unwarranted. The word is used by many men of distinguished culture not in the table.

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 78.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 308.

If *cultured* is from the noun "culture," it belongs in the class with *moneyed*, *gifted*, *talented*, which seem to be well established. *Cultivated* is probably more common in the literature, but *cultured* should not be condemned.

A few passages will show how the word is used by reputable authors. Herbert Spencer says, "Transmitting traditional statements concerning ghosts and gods, at first to neophytes of his class only, but afterward to the *cultured* classes." Frederic Harrison says, "But to Homer and the primeval type of heroic man in his beauty, and his simpleness, and joyousness, the *cultured* generation is really dead. . . ." G. K. Chesterton in his *Browning* says, "But his interest in these studies was not like that of the ordinary *cultured* visitor to the Italian cities."

The word has considerable vogue in the books of reputable scholars, editors, men of letters, and lecturers of the last twenty years.

XXIV

DEAD CORPSE

When the Bible reader meets in *II Kings* 19:35 and *Isaiah* 37:36 with the phrase, "when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all *dead corpses*," he is apt to be amazed at the use of *corpscs* coupled with *dead*. If, however, he knew that *corpse* used to mean "a living body," he would not be surprised. Chaucer often speaks of "a living corpse." Malory says, "And therewith he fell down on the one side to the earth like a *dead corpse*"; "But this night, at midnight, here came a number of ladies, and brought hither a *dead corpse*, and prayed me to bury him." (*Morte D'Arthur*.) The phrase is used by Robert Manning and Thomas Sackville. The latest case the writer has seen is in Defoe's *History of the Plague*: "Looking upon themselves all as so many *dead corpses*, they came to the churches without the least caution."

Only since Defoe's day has the word *corpse* become applied exclusively to a dead body; it is no longer used for "living body."

XXV

DEMEAN = DEBASE, DEGRADE ONESELF

Demeaned himself by marrying a French lady of birth quite inferior to his own. (*Thackeray*.)

The use of *demean* in the sense of "debase or degrade oneself" has some vogue in polite society in America. It is condemned however, by George Campbell, A. S. Hill, Genung, the Standard Dictionary, and Lord Macaulay. Fitzedward Hall gave it a wide berth but did not condemn it. The Century says, "Being thus illegitimate in origin and inconvenient in use, from its tendency to be confused with *demean* in its proper sense, the word is avoided by scrupulous writers." The Century quotes a passage from Sheridan and one from Thackeray—not the same as that at the head of this section. Webster recognizes it, quoting the same passage from *Vanity Fair* as that quoted by the Century. The New English Dictionary recognizes the word in the sense of "degrade oneself," quoting Doddridge, Richardson, Thackeray, Black, Foote, George Eliot, the *Saturday Review*, and some other authorities less known.

The writer has recorded two cases from Thackeray, one from Dickens, and one from Emerson.

Instead of *demean* Genung¹ suggests "degrade" and "be-mean." This last-named word is approved by the Century, which quotes Max Müller and James Payne as using it.

Dickens (*Our Vestry*) says, "Mr. Wagg . . . takes that opportunity of saying that, if an honorable gentleman whom he has in his eye, and will not *demean* himself by more par-

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 310.

ticularly naming. . . .” Emerson, who is more classical in his use of language, says, “His vice glasses his eye, *demeans* his cheek, pinches the nose, sets the mark of the beast on the back of the head.”

The majority of our authorities seem to be in favor of *demean* in the sense of “degrade oneself.”

XXVI

DESCRIPTION = KIND, SORT

Whenever any tolerable book of the same *description* makes its appearance, the circulating libraries are mobbed. (Macaulay: *Essay on History*.)

Quackenbos¹ says, “*Description* means an account of characteristics, and is not a synonym of *kind* or *sort*.” Genung² says, “Better not to use this in the sense of ‘kind.’ ”

The New English Dictionary recognizes the disputed use, quoting some old authors and one recent one, Ik Marvel. Webster recognizes this use of the word, quoting passages from Alexander Hamilton and Macaulay. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes, and quotes Shakespeare. The Century recognizes, quoting Shakespeare, Macaulay, Dowden, and the *Washington Chronicle*. The Standard recognizes it.

It is used by the following authorities:

Shakespeare	1	Macaulay	4
Bulwer	4	Grote	2
Lamb	2	Hawthorne	1
Jefferson	1	Poe	8
Sharon Turner	1	Lowell	1
Hallam	2	Stevenson	3

This use of *description* was common with our grandfathers and great-grandfathers and is seen frequently in the speeches

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 232.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 310.

and letters of the public men of two or three generations ago. No doubt hundreds of passages could be collected from the speeches of the elder statesmen of America, from Hamilton and Madison down to Calhoun, Clay, Webster, etc. The word is not very common in recent literature, and is giving way to shorter words like *sort* and *kind*, such being the tendency of the language.

All readers of Shakespeare remember the passage in the *Merchant of Venice* where Portia says:

Double six thousand, and then treble that,
Before a friend of this *description*
Shall lose a hair through Bassanio's fault.

Macaulay in his essay on *Hallam* says, "We will not positively affirm that a law of this *description* must always, and under all circumstances, be unjustifiable." Stevenson says, "But in the open portmanteau, no papers of any *description*"; "there was probably (my doctor added) some predisposition in the family to accidents of that *description*." (*Master of Ballantrae*.)

The word is rather old-fashioned nowadays and is rare in recent authors.

XXVII

DIFFICULTLY

The writer became interested in the adverb *difficultly* from seeing it in Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*. It is recognized by Webster, quoting the poet Cowper. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, with a quotation from the *Passenger of Benvenuto* (A.D. 1612). The Century recognizes it, quoting Fielding. Fitzedward Hall cited the following authors as using it: Barrow, Otway, Jeremy Collier, Bentley, Addison, Fielding, Dr. Johnson, Cowper, Southey, Goldsmith.

Coleridge's sentence referred to above is, "and how restless,

how *difficultly* hidden, the powers of genius are." George Campbell in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* says, "If, for instance, what is *difficultly* acted be *difficultly* pronounced," etc.

Though we all feel the need of this word at times, it is now practically obsolete: it is too "difficultly" pronounced.

Hardly as a substitute is handicapped by its frequent use in the sense of *scarcely*.

The dictionaries do not intimate that the word had such a wide vogue in earlier periods and with some of the great authors; hence this section.

XXVIII

DIRECTLY AS A CONJUNCTION

Rose turned *directly* she heard the steps and voices. (*Mrs. H. Ward.*)

The use of *directly*, *immediately*, and *instantly* as conjunctions equivalent to *as soon as* is generally called a Britishism. They are so used to some extent in the literature of England and have considerable vogue in colloquial English in England. The writer has seen no cases of them in standard American authors but sees them occasionally in minor authors.

Directly is condemned by the Century Dictionary, which quotes a passage from Dickens. Webster says, "Common in England, but not a desirable use." The New English Dictionary says, "Colloquial," but quotes Newman, Buckle, and some minor writers. Quackenbos,¹ Genung,² A. S. Hill,³ and Herriek and Damon⁴ condemn this use of *directly*. Richard Grant White⁵ condemned it but said that it was used by Buckle and Cardinal Newman.

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 233.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 310.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 337.

⁴ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, 1911, p. 263.

⁵ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 186 ff.

Jespersen,¹ however, recognizes *directly* as a "new conjunction," quoting a passage from Dickens.

The writer has seen *directly* in the following:

Thackeray	3	British Quarterly Review.....	1
Dickens	3	Bulwer	4
Matthew Arnold	1	Mrs. H. Ward.....	7

Dickens is usually regarded as the principal promoter of this word; but the writer has seen it oftener in Mrs. Ward.

Instantly is used by Thackeray in *Henry Esmond*; *immediately*, by Milman in his *History of the Jews*.

Matthew Arnold says, "*Directly* this play of mind wants to have more scope, and to forget the pressure of practical considerations a little, it is checked, it is made to feel the chain." Thackeray says, "From whom he ran across the grass *instantly* he perceived his mother, and came to her." Milman says, "The wind continued in the same quarter all the night; but *immediately* they had passed over, and while the Egyptians, madly plunging after them, were in the middle of the passage," etc.

Of course adverbs can easily become conjunctions. *Now* (see page 183, below) has been a conjunction for twelve hundred years. *Once* is going the same way: it is recognized by Jespersen,¹ with quotations from Robert Louis Stevenson and H. G. Wells. The writer has seen it several times in very good authors. The Century Dictionary notes it as "recent and specially British," quoting a passage from the *Contemporary Review*. *Once* and *directly* are taking root in America at this moment.

There is, as we have seen, considerable opposition to these "new conjunctions," but we find some excellent authors employing them occasionally.

¹ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 206.

XXIX

DONATE

Donate is condemned by Richard Grant White¹ and Genung;² also by T. L. K. Oliphant as "a new-fangled word." The Century and the Encyclopedic dictionaries call it an Americanism. The New English Dictionary says, "Chiefly U. S."

Webster and the Standard recognize it. Lounsbury³ thinks that it is needlessly abused and that it is as good as *fascinate* and some others in *-ate*. He concedes that it is an American coinage and says that it is probably about fifty years old.

Donate is no doubt a popular derivative of *donation*, which has been established in English for centuries. If so, it is what is called a "back-formation"· e.g., *beg* from *beggar*, *peddle* from *pedlar*.

The form *donate* appeals to the American *sprachgefühl*; it fills the mouth better than *give*; sounds "bigger" in the papers and on the street, and also comes, by a familiar process, from the noun *donation*. With all these things in its favor, it seems to be establishing itself in the popular language on this side of the ocean.

Some good scholars forget that most of our words were once new-fangled, or rather, neologisms. Others think that no good thing can come out of America. If the millionaire-philanthropists and their clients need a new word, why not let them have it? Words, like politicians, may have a constituency.

The writer has not seen the word in his course of reading in the literature: *give* is the standard word; *donate* may yet have its day.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 205, 206.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 311.

³ *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 194.

XXX

DOUBLE COMPARATIVES AND SUPERLATIVES

Every reader of Shakespeare will recall *more elder*, *most unkindest*, and other double comparatives and superlatives. These are treated by Abbott in his *Shakespearian Grammar*, § 11. Abbott says that the old English endings *er* and *est* lost some of their force and were sometimes reinforced by "more" and "most" for the purposes of emphasis. Kellner, in his *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, § 254, says, "The language, hesitating between the old English and the French way of comparison, often uses both." They cite examples from Layamon, Mandeville, Caxton, Malory, and Shakespeare.

Double comparatives and superlatives are found in various periods of English. *Lesser*, for instance, is still common in the literature, and *foremost* is too well known to need any defense. The illiterate classes have coined *onlicst*, which is psychologically a double superlative.

Thomas Malory says, "This is the *most shamefullest* message that ever I heard speak of." Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* says,

Brutus shall lead, and we will grace his heels
With the *most boldest* and best hearts of Rome.

In *Hamlet*, Polonius says to Reynaldo (II. i. 11):

come you *more nearer*
Than your particular demands will touch it.

The only recent case of the double superlative or comparative that the author has recorded is in Swinburne's *Atalanta in Calydon*:

Touch the *most dimmest* heights of trembling heaven.

XXXI

THE DOUBLE NEGATIVE

Nor never look upon each other's face;

Nor never write, regret, *nor* reconcile, *etc.* (*Shakespeare.*)

Never no imitator ever grew up to his author. (*Ben Jonson.*)

Why should the Double Negative be treated in this volume? Is the author attempting to revive this construction so long banished from polite society and from literature? By no means; but he will show that the double negative lived on in very considerable vigor till pretty late in good English, and that it did not disappear entirely from standard literature until the time of millions now living.

For the benefit of those who are not special students of English let us make a few prefatory statements. Two negatives were used very frequently in Anglo-Saxon, and are found in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German. They occur frequently in Chaucer, Malory, the Miracle Plays, Caxton, Latimer, and other works and authors of the early modern period. Oliphant¹ says, "Caxton was unable to pass the Double Negative on to Tyndale, a generation later." But, though Tyndale avoided it, it was used by others of his day and of later days. During the sixteenth century some used it and others avoided it. Sir Thomas More, Latimer, Tunstall, Andrew Boorde and other well-known men used it, while others as well known dropped it. At the end of the sixteenth century, we find it used considerably by Shakespeare, though the editors have changed the texts of Shakespeare in many passages. Oliphant² thinks that Sir Thomas Gresham (1519-1579) "was the last great Englishman who took much pleasure in the Double Negative." About 1700, it was used

¹ *The New English*, I, 330.

² *The New English*, I, 568.

by Jeremy Collier, a prominent theologian and political writer. Toward the end of the century, Lamb used it in a letter to Coleridge (1797): "*can't see no wit in her.*"¹ Cowley used it about the middle of the preceding century. The writer has seen no cases of it in Milton and Jeremy Taylor. There is one case in *Cranford*, published in 1853. Mrs. Gaskell says, "Mrs. Jamieson must have looked at the wall above her, for she *never* moved a muscle of her face, *no* more than if she had not seen her." In Browning's poems published between 1844 and 1864, we find "*not a bad assembly neither*"; "*you cannot speak from the churchyard neither*"—both common Shakespearean negative constructions, but a modified double negative, not like the one from Ben Jonson at the head of this chapter. These are exactly like the modified double negative seen in Latin: *e.g.*, *Numquam* (Scipionem) *ne minima quidem re offendi*. (Cicero to Laelius.)

One type of the double negative—*nor . . . neither*—has been pretty common in the literature down to the present time. This is the kind paralleled in Cicero and Nepos; while the genuine, unmodified double negative always makes an affirmative in classical Latin. The study of Greek being so unusual, we may say here that the heaping of compound negatives was very common in that language; *e.g.*, "*Nobody told me nothing about nobody.*" We have reason to believe that *early* Latin used two negatives for emphasis.

Do two negatives, then, really make an affirmative as our teachers have told us and as we have told others? By no means. This rule, says Lounsbury, was "foisted upon" us from the Latin; it does not belong naturally to the English language. The double negative is indigenous to the Teutonic languages; how natural it is to ours, popular speech shows us. The double negative fought hard for its life in the sixteenth century but succumbed finally to scholastic influences. It is

¹ This may have been meant for humor, but Lamb was fond of old constructions.

out of vogue but not ungrammatical. It sometimes crops out at inopportune times in the speech of self-taught men and women who have heard it from their elders and their teachers. It is natural.

It may be added that the double negative springs from the desire for emphasis and seems to be natural to human language.

In recent texts of Shakespeare the double negatives are being restored to the text. Schmidt, the German Shakespearian scholar, says that two negatives were very common in Elizabethan English. He adds, "Much that would blemish the language of a logician may well become a poet or an orator."

At the head of this section, the author quoted from Shakespeare a passage involving two negatives. Just below this there is another passage that has been "corrected" by early editors:

Nor never by advised purpose meet
To plot, contrive, or complot any ill.

Again, in the same play (*Richard II*, V. v. 70):

Where *no* man *never* comes, but that sad dog
That brings me food to make misfortune live.

These negatives are all found in the First Folio (1623), but, when the double negative gradually passed out of vogue, the editors thought that the text was corrupt and amended it accordingly. Recent editions of Shakespeare's plays abound with the double negative.

As to whether two negatives make an affirmative, let us quote Greenough and Kittredge¹: "Two negatives may make an affirmative in logic, but they seldom do in English speech." *Not unnecessary, not impossible*, etc., they call "somewhat artificial."

¹ *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, pp. 220, 312.

XXXII

DOVE FOR DIVED

Professor John Earle¹ says, "The preterite *dove* of the verb *dive* survives not only in the poetry of Longfellow but also in American prose." Earle cites a passage from Dr. Hayes's *Open Polar Sea*, and is referring to a passage in the earlier editions of *Hiawatha*; but Longfellow, in later editions, changed *dove* to *dived*, probably after some critics had attacked the word as out of date. In 1855, Trench spoke of some words that are "old rather than bad English," *dove* among the number. He refers to a passage in Longfellow and one other, not named, but probably in Hayes's book. The Century recognizes *dove*, quoting a passage from G. W. Cable. Carpenter² says, "*Dived* or *dove*." Worcester says, "Rarely *dove*." Quackenbos says that the form *dove* has disappeared. Webster's International and the Standard call it "colloquial." The New English Dictionary says, "Dialectical U. S. and England," but quotes Dr. Hayes and the *New York Herald* (1882). Kittredge and Farley³ say, "*Dove* is common in America"; but this can hardly refer to the literature.

The only case of *dove* that the present writer has seen in a wide course of reading is in H. W. Mabie's *Norse Stories*: "Then he sprang up, threw the net into the fire, and running to the river changed himself into a salmon, and *dove* deep into the still waters." Earle's statement is rather apt to mislead the student.

Dived is certainly supreme in polite society and in literature, but *dove* has great vitality in "popular talk."

¹ *Philology of the English Tongue*, 1887, p. 278.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, 1898, p. 242.

³ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 298.

XXXIII

DRANK AS A PARTICIPLE

Of course *drunk* is much commoner than *drank* as a participle. The New English Dictionary says, "From the seventeenth to the nineteenth century *drank* was intruded from the past tense into the past participle to avoid the inebriate associations of *drunk*." This dictionary quotes Hume, Dr. Johnson, Shelley, Clarendon, and one or two others as using *drank*. *Drank* is recognized by the Century Dictionary, Geo. R. Carpenter,¹ Baskervill and Sewell,² and Webster. Baskervill and Sewell quote examples from Thackeray and Bayard Taylor. Cardinal Newman is quoted as using *drank*. A. S. Hill says,³ "Best modern usage requires *drunk*." Krapp⁴ says, "Historically *drunk* is the better form." John Fiske in quoting a passage involving *drank* marked it "sic," showing that he did not like it.

Drank is used in the following:

Smythe's Travels	1	Milman	1
Hugh Jones ⁵	1	Kingsley	1
Arbuthnot	1	Poe	1
Southey	1	Stevenson	1
D'Israeli	1	Mabie	1

The form *drank* has considerable vogue in polite colloquial English. Our lists show that it is not a vulgarism in any sense; does not rank with *rang*, used by some educated people of some parts of the U. S.; e.g., "The bell has *rang*"; but *drunk* is the regular form.

Milman says, "so bitter that it could not be *drank*." Stevenson says, "It was observed that he had also eaten with unusual heartiness, and *drank* deep."

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 242.

² *English Grammar*, p. 155.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 146.

⁴ *Modern English*, p. 292.

⁵ *Present State of Virginia*.

XXXIV

ĚAT FOR ATE

Ate is the usual preterite of *eat*, but *ěat* has some standing in literature and in polite colloquial English.

Fitzedward Hall¹ in 1873 said that *ěat* was "grossly ignorant but was good once." Webster says, "Obsolescent and colloquial." Gemung² says, "Not in good use." George Campbell preferred *ate* but said that *ěat* was used to some extent. A. S. Hill,³ while admitting that *ěat* has some standing, says that *ate* is "far preferable." Kittredge and Farley do not recognize *ěat* in their grammar, published in 1913.

Worcester, the Standard, the Century, and the New English dictionaries recognize *ěat* as a secondary form of the preterite, but prefer *ate*. The New English Dictionary quotes John Evelyn as using *ěat*. Baskervill and Sewell⁴ recognize *ěat* as a second form and cite a passage from Milton's poetry. Carpenter,⁵ Whitney,⁶ Richard Morris,⁷ and Lounsbury⁸ give both *ate* and *ěat*.

The writer has seen it in the following:

Milton	1	Boswell	2
Izaak Walton	1	Matthew Prior	2
Pepys	2	Dickens	1
Defoe	1	Stevenson	4
Goldsmith	2		

The form is still in use among some of the upper classes of the old states, having been brought over to the colonies in the seventeenth century, when it was in good standing in England.

¹ *Modern English*, p. 207.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 312.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 146.

⁴ *English Grammar*, p. 158.

⁵ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 242.

⁶ *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 114.

⁷ *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, 1903, p. 237.

⁸ *History of the English Language*, p. 335.

Milton in *Paradise Regained* says,

In the Mount
Moses was forty days, nor *eat* nor drank.

Pepys says, "we put in, and *eat* a mouthful of porke." Boswell says, "They who beheld with wonder how much he *eat* upon all occasions when his dinner was to his taste." etc.

Stevenson gave the form a good start in recent literature.

XXXV

ĚAT FOR EATEN

Eaten is, of course, the usual participle, but *ěat* has some standing.

Webster says, "Obsolescent or colloquial." A. S. Hill¹ says, "Confined to the illiterate." Kittredge and Farley and the New English Dictionary do not recognize it.

George Campbell, though he prefers *caten*, says that *ěat* was used in his day. It is recognized as permissible by Worcester, the Standard, and the Century. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Shakespeare and Tennyson. The grammarians Carpenter,² Richard Morris,³ Baskervill and Sewell⁴ recognize it as one form of the participle. Lounsbury⁵ recognizes it in his various editions.

The form *ěat* is found in the following:

Shakespeare	3	Coleridge	1
Two Noble Kinsmen	1	Tennyson	1
Dr. Samuel Johnson.....	1	Dickens	4
Matthew Prior	1		

How can Hill say that *ěat* is confined to the illiterate?

The writer has not seen the form in any living author of

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1900, p. 146.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 242.

³ *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, p. 237.

⁴ *English Grammar*, p. 158.

⁵ *History of the English Language*, p. 335.

high repute. It is heard occasionally among the polite classes of the old states but seems to be gradually dying out. It was brought over by the colonists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when it had considerable vogue in England.

Two passages in famous literature help to keep *eat* in use: first, Coleridge's line,

It ate the food it ne'er had *eat*;

second, Tennyson's passage,

the island princes over-bold
Have *eat* our substance.

Dickens uses the form at least four times in *Pickwick Papers*; but some may not regard him as a high authority on usage.

XXXVI

EDITORIAL AS A NOUN

The use of *editorial* as a noun was condemned by Richard Grant White¹ as "an unpleasant Americanism." The English authors avoid it, using "leader" and "leading article." A. S. Hill,² though criticizing *editorial*, says, "It may in time be accepted." It is already accepted by Worcester, Webster, the Standard, the Encyclopedie, the New English, and the Century dictionaries, the last-named quoting the *Century Magazine* as an authority. The New English Dictionary quotes only the *Pall Mall Gazette* in England; Mrs. H. B. Stowe and *Harper's Magazine* in America. The word occurs in the textbooks of Professors Quackenbos, John S. Hart, and Scott and Denney, whose opinion will carry weight with many readers. Though avoided in England, the word in question has wide vogue in the United States both in periodical lit-

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, p. 109.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 104.

erature and in polite colloquial English; in standard literature it has been seen very rarely by the author of this volume. Genung¹ says, "Seems to be coming into good usage as a noun instead of 'editorial article.'"

Editorial is used by:

D. G. Mitchell.....	1	John S. Hart	11
H. W. Mabie.....	1	Holmes	1

George Eliot uses "leader." Richard Grant White, Dean Alford, T. L. K. Oliphant, and Justin McCarthy use "leading article." This phrase is inexact, while both this and "editorial article" are too cumbersome for the English language, famous for its practical character.

Donald G. Mitchell in *Dream Life* says, "You think all the *editorials* in the morning papers are remarkably well written, —whether upon your side, or upon the other." H. W. Mabie, in a recent essay, says, "The Civil War was in the near future, and there were no more carefully reasoned *editorials* on the situation and the questions involved than those that appeared in this very influential journal." In the last sentence, a "cultivated man who is neither specialist nor pedant"² uses both *editorial* and *journal* in meanings that make the puristic writers shudder.

As already said, the author believes that Greenough and Kittredge are right in recognizing the authority of such men as Mitchell and Mabie, though in matters of usage we lay special stress upon such authors as Macaulay, Tennyson, and Wordsworth.

It may be added that the noun *editorial* is often seen in books by men of literary ability who do not happen to be famous but have a "genius for idiom." Would the average American reader understand "leader" and "leading article"?

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 312.

² Greenough and Kittredge: *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 122.

XXXVII

EITHER = EACH OF TWO

On *either* side the river lie

Long fields of barley and of rye. (*Tennyson.*)

The use of *either* for *both* is criticized—though mildly—by Genung;¹ he says, “*Each* would be better.” It is recognized by the Standard, the New English, Webster’s, the Encyclopedic, and the Century dictionaries, which quote King Alfred, Coverdale, the King James Bible, Milton, Scott, Hobbes, Jowett, Prescott, Cowper, Tennyson, and others. It is recognized by Nesfield,² the grammarian.

This use of *either* is common in Chaucer, and is found very often in Malory. In more modern authors the following cases have been noted:

King James Bible.....	2	Dickens	10
Gorbodue	1	Bayard Taylor	2
Shakespeare	4	Hawthorne	7
Milton	7	Motley	3
Addison	4	De Quincey	2
Swift	3	Matthew Arnold	2
Prior	3	Tennyson	30
Pope	1	William Minto	1
Dryden	3	Cooper	2
Dr. Johnson	1	Bulwer	9
Gibbon	2	Milman	1
Fielding	5	Poe	4
Gray	2	Thackeray	7
Philip Freneau	1	Whittier	1
Scott	16	Bryant	2
Wordsworth	4	Andrew Lang	2
Keats	3	Wm. Morris	3
Pollok	1	Froude	1
Irving	1	Holmes	1

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 312.

² *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 29.

Fiske	1	G. W. Cable	4
W. W. Skeat.....	1	T. N. Page.....	3
Kingsley	2	Kipling	1
Clough	2	Henry van Dyke.....	1
Browning	9	Swinburne	3
Brooke	2	George Meredith	1
Rossetti	3	T. B. Aldrich	1
Stevenson	12		

Here are over 50 authorities, in all periods.

Tennyson uses the word very frequently; only a fraction of his use of the word is shown in the table.

Additional examples may be given.

In this lone, open glade I lie,
Screened by deep boughs on *either* hand. (*Arnold*.)

And drops of water fell from *either* hand. (*Tennyson*.)

The benches at *either* end of the platform were accordingly filled with the royal and princely personages invited. (*Motley*.)

the great quadruple city on *either* side of the Nile, Luxor and their satellites. (*Milman*.)

On *either* side were horizontal niches. (*Hawthorne*.)

XXXVIII

EITHER REFERRING TO MORE THAN TWO

Quackenbos¹ says, "*Either* always implies *two*." Genung² says, "To be used of two objects; *any one*, of more than two." Baskervill and Sewell,³ while preferring *any*, give sentences from Edward Everett and Emerson in which *either* and *neither* refer to more than two. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting W. D. Howells.

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 233.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 312.

³ *English Grammar*, p. 300.

The writer has noted it in the following:

Poe	3	Churton Collins	1
Emerson	1	H. W. Mabie	1
O. W. Holmes	1	J. F. Genung	1
W. D. Whitney	2	John Earle	1

Whitney, for instance, says, "*either* of the last three syllables," and "*either* of the (four) languages named." Genung says, "as *either* of these" (three), etc. Here we see that Genung's own rule is too strict for him to obey, because it is stricter than the language itself. It would seem that the authors and the professors of rhetoric clash here as in many other places.

Churton Collins says, "*either* of the first three quartos of *Romeo and Juliet*." Poe in *The Black Cat* says, "Finally I hit upon what I considered a far better expedient than *either* of these (four plans)." Poe uses *neither* of six or seven. Holmes uses *either* referring to four things. Whitney says, "in Greek it may be given to *either* of the last three syllables." Again: "no one, probably, who has ever added a knowledge of *either* of the (several) languages named to that of his mother-tongue," etc.

XXXIX

FORMS IN ELSE AND ELSE'S

Many intelligent persons hesitate between forms like *somebody else's* and *somebody's else*.

Oliphant¹ says that the form in *else's* began to appear in the literature about 1840 and that it originated with Dickens. The earliest examples found by the writer are in Thackeray, 1851 and 1852, and the earliest in Dickens in 1860; but we need not doubt the correctness of Oliphant's statement, as Dickens wrote some of his greatest books as early as 1840.

¹ *The New English*, II, 208.

Jespersen,¹ after saying that the ancient practice was to add 's to the pronoun and not to *else*, and that afterwards it was in most cases added to the *else*, quotes *nones else* from an author of 1665; *anybody's else* from Thackeray; and *nobody's else* from Mark Twain. Of the *else's* form, he quotes eight examples from reputable authors, Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot among them.

The Century Dictionary and the best modern grammars treat *somebody else* and its congeners as compound pronouns with the *s* at the end. This is the easiest and the best solution of the question.

Baskervill and Sewell² in their grammar take the view given above. They cite eight examples from reputable authors, all of them using *else's* before the noun; e.g., *nobody else's business*.

A. S. Hill,³ while taking the same view as the authorities cited above, says that Henry James and Horace Walpole sometimes use *anybody's else*, Walpole using it both with and without the noun; but it may be said that *anybody's else life*, as used by Walpole, is extremely rare in literature and is utterly intolerable.

When the noun is present, the almost universal usage is *else's*. It occurs pretty often in Dickens and in George Eliot; occasionally in Thackeray and in Walter Bagehot. The writer's figures are: *Somebody else's book*, 13; *somebody's else book*, none. This book is *somebody else's*, 8; this book is *somebody's else*, 2. Of this last type the writer has seen one case in Congreve and one in Thackeray; none in Dickens and in George Eliot.

These locutions are not very common in standard literature. Possibly the uncertainty as to the correct possessive form has frightened some writers away from it. It may be that the

¹ *Progress in Language*, p. 298.

² *English Grammar*, p. 303.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 47.

statements made in the foregoing paragraphs will "strengthen the feeble knees" and help this very useful and convenient form to be of greater service.

If *some* and *body* can unite and form *somebody*; if *any* and *body* can form *anybody*; if *no* and *thing* can form *nothing*—and so on—why cannot *some* and *body* and *else* be treated as a unit and take the possessive *s*? Again: why cannot *somebodyelse*, *nobodyelse*, etc., come, after a while, to be written as one word?

A locution analogous to this is the phrasal genitive, *e.g.*, *The King of England's* palace, *the Duke of Gloucester's* wickedness, which is well established in English, though unthinkable in Latin.

As to *who*+*else*, there is some uncertainty. Jespersen,¹ after quoting *who else's daughter* from reputable literature, says, "Some people would perhaps prefer 'whose else.' " Certainly he cannot mean *whose else daughter*: this is intolerable. Sir James Murray, the great English scholar, told Jespersen that he would say *who else's baby* but *whose else* without a substantive; *e.g.*, "Whose else can it be?"

A few passages from the literature will no doubt prove interesting. George Eliot says, "He never, indeed, chose to be absolute except on some one *else's* behalf;" "thinking their own (fool's cap) lies opaque while everybody *else's* were transparent." Ruskin says, "Everybody *else's* Fortitudes announce themselves clearly and forcibly." Saintsbury says, "is his and no one *else's*."

¹ *Progress in Language*, p. 299.

XL

ENCOUNTER

I drew my chair towards him in silence, and, accidentally lifting up my eyes, *encountered* the opposite mirror. (*Bulwer.*)

She bestirred herself in an obliging way that was the most charming thing yet *encountered*. (*G. W. Cable.*)

From the connotation of hostility so often seen in the word *encounter*, one might infer that the use of the word seen in the two sentences at the head of this section was not proper. It is, however, recognized in this passive, or inoffensive, sense by the Century, the Encyclopedic, and Webster's dictionaries, the last named saying, however, "especially as enemies." It is recognized by the New English Dictionary, quoting Raleigh, Evelyn, Johnson, Byron, Tyndall, and Hamerton.

This use of the word, though rather old-fashioned, is found in some of our best recent authors.

The writer has traced it through the following authors:

Dr. Johnson	1	Dean Stanley	1
Prescott	1	Milman	1
Cooper	1	Christopher North	1
Dean Trench	1	George Eliot	3
Poe	4	Lounsbury	1
H. T. Tuckerman	1	James Lane Allen	1
Bulwer	1	John Fiske	1
Scott	1	G. W. Cable.....	4
Hawthorne	9	Stevenson	1

It is still heard with old-fashioned people in the old states and, like so much of their "dialect," has the best possible pedigree, though other words are more usual.

The following sentences show the word in its pleasant connotation. Poe in the *Purloined Letter* says, "In short, I never yet *encountered* the mere mathematician who could be trusted

out of equal roots." Hawthorne, who is especially partial to the word, says, "Miriam had *encountered* an unknown man, and led him forth with her"; "the air was full of kindred melodies that *encountered* one another"; "*encountering* so rare a being, and gifted with the power of sympathy with his sunny life." All these are from *The Marble Faun*. Dean Stanley says, "Here they *encountered* a monk, who with the 'sprengel' sprinkled all their heads with holy water."

The word has a continuous history all the way from Samuel Johnson to some of the most reputable living writers; but Webster is correct in saying "especially as enemies."

XLI

EVER SO AND NEVER SO

Quackenbos¹ condemns *ever so* as the "very opposite of what is intended" and commends Carlyle for using *never so*. The Century quotes a case of *ever so* in the old ballad of *Childe Maurice*. Webster cites examples of it from Emerson, Pope, and Thackeray. Mätzner² cites examples from Butler, Rowe, Fielding, and Pope. Oliphant³ cites one case of *ever so* as occurring between 1558 and 1570, and adds, "We have seen *never so*." Of course, because *never so* was almost the only form for hundreds of years. *Ever so* is rare in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the eighteenth century it began to overtake *never so* and has been much more common for about two centuries.

Of *ever so*, the writer has recorded the following cases:

Anglo Saxon (Alfred).....	1	Pope	1
Bolingbroke	1	N. Bailey	1
Fielding	4	Chesterfield	10

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, edition of 1896, p. 234.

² *English Grammar* (Greece's translation), III, 130.

³ *The New English*, I, 556.

Shaftesbury	2	Bret Harte	1
Boswell	1	Edward Eggleston	1
Jonathan Edwards	1	Browning	1
Dr. Johnson	10	Ruskin	3
Goldsmith	2	Holmes	4
George Campbell	1	H. N. Hudson.....	1
William Hazlitt	2	G. W. Cable.....	1
Byron	1	Swinburne	2
J. Howard Payne	2	Richard Grant White.....	1
Grote	1	William Morris	1
De Quincey	1	Thackeray	38
Lamb	2	Dean Stanley	1
Dr. Hugh Blair	4	Hawthorne	3
Dr. John Brown	2	Tennyson	2
Christopher North	2	Poe	1
Matthew Arnold	1	Fitzedward Hall	1

Summary: 38 authorities, 113 cases.

Thackeray uses *ever so* 38 times in the books read in this course of study; *never so*, only once.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, both Johnson and George Campbell expressed a decided preference for *ever so*; and, as far as the writer has noticed, Johnson used it exclusively. The support of these two men may have helped *ever so* considerably, though the tendency in its favor had already developed.

Never so, like its rival, begins in the Anglo-Saxon. It runs through Chaucer, Malory, the Miracle Plays, Latimer, Bacon, Shakespeare, the Bible, and Milton. While *never so* was so vigorous, *ever so* was lying quiescent, to emerge in the sixteenth century.

The Century Dictionary quotes Mandeville, the Bible, and Sandys as using *never so*. It adds that *never so* is now usually replaced by *ever so*; it should say that *ever so* is more common in recent literature. Webster quotes the Bible and Blackstone as using *never so*. Greenough and Kittredge¹ say, "the negative form is still occasionally used." (This is rather

¹ *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 316.

underestimating its vitality.) Mätzner¹ quotes cases of *never so* from Anglo-Saxon, Middle English, the Miracle Plays, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Richard Bentley. A. S. West, in his edition of Bacon's Essays, says, "'Never so' in modern idiom *ever so*," though he justifies the former also.

Carlyle, as far as the writer has noticed, always uses the negative form—16 to 0.

Never so has been noted in the following:

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle	1	Bishop Burnet	1
Chaucer	2	Congreve	1
Miracle Plays	7	Cowley	1
Malory	2	Fielding	9
Marlowe	3	South	3
Massinger	1	Sprat	2
Shakespeare	7	John Knox	2
Bible	3	Bishop Percy	1
Prayer Book	2	Thackeray	1
Bacon	7	Emerson	3
Latimer	10	George William Curtis	1
Izaak Walton	1	Browning	3
Thomas More	1	Freeman	1
Lyly	2	Carlyle	16
John Webster	3	Ruskin	1
Jeremy Taylor	1	Kingsley	1
Butler	1	G. W. Cable	1
Milton	5	Hart and Hart	1
Clarendon	1	E. C. Stedman	1
Matthew Prior	2		

Summary: 39 authorities, 112 cases.

Both phrases, then, had their birth in the Anglo-Saxon period. Both are logical, if that is to be counted. Both have good usage in their favor. The negative form seems to be gradually passing out of the language except in a few circles, where the influence of Shakespeare, the Bible, and Carlyle is felt especially. In the seventeenth century, the two locutions ran somewhat together. With Dr. Johnson, *ever so* made a big

¹ *English Grammar* (Greece's translation), III, pp. 130, 131.

leap. Since then it has distanced *never so*. Taking the literature as a whole, the two phrases are about even. For the last two centuries, *ever so* is far more common.

In 1864 Dean Alford said, "In familiar speech we mostly say *ever so*; in writing, especially in the solemn and elevated style, we mostly find *never so*. . . . These two amount to the same." The Oxford Dictionary says that *ever so* has been substituted, "from a notion of logical propriety," for *never so*, "which in literary use appears to be much older and still occurs archaically." As to the respective ages of the two locutions, nothing more need be said. As to the archaic use of *never so* it may be said that some writers and speakers use it, not because they wish to be archaic, but because they do not know which is better and because they vaguely remember seeing it in some of the old standard books, especially the Bible, the Prayer Book, and Shakespeare.

For a full explanation of both phrases under discussion, the reader is referred to the Century Dictionary under the word *never*, and to Greenough and Kittredge's *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, page 316.

We may conclude this section by quoting passages from the literature.

Tennyson in the *Holy Grail*, line 614 ff., says,

And this am I, so that ye care for me
Ever so little.

In *Maud*, he says,

She is coming, my own, my sweet;
Were it *ever so* airy a tread,
My heart would hear her and beat,
Were it earth in an earthy bed.

Ruskin (*Crown of Wild Olive*) says, "You must put your ear down *ever so* close to her lips, to hear her speak." Matthew Arnold in his *Last Words on Translating Homer* says, "they are, and must remain, like those lines we read of in Euclid,

which, though produced *ever so* far, can never meet." Hawthorne in the *Marble Faun* says, "she might have helped to fill the already crowded and embered world with pictures, not destitute of merit, but falling short, if by *ever so* little, of the best that has been done"; "the grape-juice that gushed beneath his childish tread, be it *ever so* small in quantity, sufficed to impart a pleasant flavor to a whole cask of wine." (No cases of *never so* have been found in Hawthorne by the author of this volume.)

Emerson says (*The Poet*), "Man, *never so* often deceived, still watches for the arrival of a brother who can hold him steady to a truth, until he has made it his own"; "and *never so* surprising, the fact of mechanics has not gained a grain's weight." (Emerson, like Carlyle, seems to use the *never so* habitually.)

Browning uses both forms but *never so* more frequently. In *Waring* he says,

A pilot for you to Triest?
Without one, look you *ne'er so* big,
They'll never let you up the bay.
We natives should know best.

In his *Madhouse Cell* he says,

No suns and moons though *e'er so* bright,
Avail to stop me.

How can either locution be condemned by those who follow the great authors?

XLII

EVERY AS A PRONOUN

Every as a pronoun, e.g., "*Every* of us," survived until some time after Shakespeare. Abbott treats it in his *Shakespearean Grammar*,¹ and every student of Shakespeare meets it in his reading; of course, it is obsolete now.

¹ P. 24.

It was common in Chaucer and is seen pretty frequently in Malory; occasionally in Thomas More and Bacon. The writer has seen it three times in Jeremy Taylor: “*every* of his creatures”, “*every* of these”, “*every* of its members.” Taylor died in 1667. The Century quotes a passage from Winthrop’s *History of New England*, whose author died in 1649. The Encyclopedic Dictionary quotes a passage from the Rev. Henry Hammond, who died in 1660. The latest examples that the writer has are taken from Defoe’s *History of the Plague*, published in 1722: “and *every* of these to have one quarter for his limit; and the said chirurgeons in *every* of their limits to join with the searchers,” etc. Bacon says, “That *Every* of them is carried swiftly by the Highest Motion.” Jeremy Taylor writes, “so is God not dishonored when we suppose him in *every* of his creatures.”

XLIII

EVIDENCE AS A VERB

Evidence as a verb is recognized by the Century Dictionary, with quotations from William Bradford, Tillotson, Huxley and Youmans, and S. Dowell. Webster’s International Dictionary recognizes it, citing Milton as an authority. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Hale and Glanvill. Worcester and the Standard recognize it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting William Penn, Jane Austen, Young, Lyell, and others.

The writer has seen it in the following authors:

Coleridge	1	Rev. Dr. James Orr	1
Hallam	1	Henry A. Beers.....	1
Professor John Earle	1	H. W. Mabie.....	3

This use of *evidence* has been in the language for hundreds of years. Moreover, it is used by eminent authors like Milton

and Coleridge, as well as by "cultivated men who are neither specialists nor pedants," in their books and their speeches.

Again: it is very natural for a noun to be used as a verb. This disposes of one objection to the word.

Evidence as a verb used to be stigmatized as an Americanism. This charge is unwarranted for the following reasons: (1) The word is found in the best English literature before the poor, wretched Americans had begun to pollute "the well of English undefiled"; (2) most of the authors cited above are Englishmen.

Coleridge, in a letter dated February 28, 1819, says, "This was most strikingly *evidenced* in the coincidence between my lectures and those of Schlegel." Hamilton W. Mabie in his volume on Shakespeare says, "In the following year his growing influence was *evidenced* by his election as tester of the quality of bread and of malt liquors." Hallam in his *Middle Ages* says, "The subsequent recognition of almost all Germany, and a sort of possession *evidenced* by public acts, which have been held valid," etc.

We often hear the word used as a verb by reputable public speakers.

XLIV

EXECUTE = PUT TO DEATH

Richard Grant White¹ was especially severe in his condemnation of *execute* in the meaning of "put to death." A *law*, says he, may be executed, but not a man. He criticizes "a well-known historian" for using the word in connection with Anne Boleyn. Another violent enemy of the word was Walter Savage Landor, who, to use the phrase of Professor Lounsbury, was "fully possessed by that devil of derivation which, unlike the evil spirit of Scripture, makes happy him

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 111, 112.

in whom it dwells and vexes only the souls of those with whom he comes in contact." Genung¹ says, "*Execute* has come into such frequent misuse as applied to a personal object in the sense of put to death, that it would be hard to displace. Strictly speaking, it is not the criminal, but the sentence, that is executed." See how the evil spirit of derivation can tear such noble spirits as White, Landor, and Genung; but, unlike the spirit in the scripture, he will not come out of *them* and go into the herd of swine.

Lounsbury² defends the use of *execute* under discussion. He says all through his chapters on language that it is the present meaning of the word, not its etymology, that we are to consider first of all. The Century recognizes the word, and quotes Shakespeare. Webster recognizes it and uses the phrase "to execute a traitor." The Standard and Worcester recognize it. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Shakespeare. The Oxford Dictionary recognizes it, with passages from Caxton, Lord Berners, and Hall, the chronicler. Lounsbury says that *execute* in the meaning of "put to death" has been in continuous use ever since the fifteenth century. Oliphant³ cites an example of it from Warkworth's Chronicle, about A.D. 1470. Latimer uses *execution* frequently.

To the authorities named above, the writer can add the following:

Shakespeare ⁴	3	Macaulay	6
Gibbon	1	Motley	4

We may, then, reasonably conclude that the word has had a continuous history from the fifteenth century to the present day. It may be worth adding that it is so much alive today that it has lent its ending to the Greek *ἤλεκτρο* (*electro*) to

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 314.

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 43, 149. ..

³ *The New English*, I, 325.

⁴ The concordance will show that Shakespeare uses *execute*, *executed*, and *executioner* frequently.

form *electro-cute*, now knocking for admission at the gates of the language.

The author has not watched the word *excecution* closely in the literature but does not hesitate to say that numberless authors and speakers use it. "He was led to *excecution*"—who would hesitate to use that sentence? If *execution* is right, *excecute* is equally so: the objection to one holds against the other. "Various modes of *execution*"; "various modes of *excecuting* criminals"—who will quarrel with these phrases?

Gibbon (*History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*) says, "The patrician was *executed* on the ready accusation of treason, and the wife of Alexander driven with ignominy from the palace, and banished into Africa." Macaulay, in his essay on Lord Bacon, says, "The unhappy nobleman was *executed*." John Fiske (*Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*) says, "Smith describes himself as kindly treated on his way to the scene of *execution* and after his rescue."

XLV

EXPERIENCE AS A VERB

In 1864, Dean Alford¹ said, "in the best English, *experience* is a substantive, not a verb at all." If the Dean had read the best English with this word in mind, he would not have spoken so dogmatically; he could easily have found it in Goldsmith, Gibbon, Lamb, Hallam, Poe, and other "best English" writers. Genung² says, "Better not use." The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Southwell and Browning. The Standard, Webster, and Worcester all recognize it. The Encyclopædic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting *The Guardian*. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, with passages from Joseph Butler, Tyndall, and others.

¹ *The Queen's English*, edition of 1866, p. 252.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 314.

If names and numbers count, the case is proved already; but the following authors may be added:

Steele	1	Bulwer	1
Hume	3	Macaulay	6
Fielding	7	Hawthorne	1
Goldsmith	2	Dickens	1
Gibbon	13	Matthew Arnold	1
Franklin	1	Holmes	1
Lamb	2	Sir Henry Taylor.....	4
Hallam	5	Lowell	2
Grote	3	Walter Bagehot	1
Poe	35	H. A. Beers.....	1
Edward Fitzgerald.....	1	Lounsbury	2
Carlyle	1	Bret Harte	1

Genung advises the student not to say "experienced much difficulty"; but Charles Lamb says, "The particular kindness . . . which I have *experienced* from you" and "a certain absence (of mind) which some of your friends may have *experienced*." Carlyle says, "I was even near *experiencing* the now obsolete sentiment of Friendship." Gibbon and Poe are very partial to the word.

The word *experience* as a verb, though a little old-fashioned, has considerable vogue among recent writers of good standing not quoted in the tables.

XLVI

FEMALE AS A NOUN

Professor A. S. Hill¹ said in 1902, "*Female*, as a synonym for *woman*, is no longer used by good writers except as an expression of contempt." (He cites Miss Fanny Burney and Scott as having used the word before it fell into disrepute.) For numerous eminent contemporaries of Hill who used the

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 87.

word instead of *woman*, see the lists below made by both Lounsbury and the author of this volume.

Richard Grant White¹ is probably the most vehement opponent of the word *female* in the sense of "woman." He says, "one of the most unpleasant and inexcusable of the common perversions of language. It is not a Britishism, although it is much more in vogue among British writers and speakers than among our own." (This is probably true, though Motley, Holmes, Cooper, Hawthorne, and Price Collier are fond of the word.) White continues: "There is no lack of what is called authoritative usage during three centuries for this misuse of *female*. But this is one of those perversions which are justified by no example, however eminent. . . . when a woman calls herself a female, she merely shares her sex with all her fellow-females throughout the brute creation."

Quackenbos says,² "is universally condemned as 'one of the most unpleasant and inexcusable perversions of language.'" Here Quackenbos quotes White approvingly. Herriek and Damon³ say, "good use now condemns it as a vulgarism." Genung says,⁴ "not to be used for *woman*." Some of the dictionaries do not recognize it in the meaning of "woman" but of the whole genus of sex provided with ovaries. The New English Dictionary says, "Now commonly avoided by good writers except with contemptuous implication." This authority quotes Wycliffe, Shakespeare, Steele, and Strutt, but no recent authors. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says, "Word of opprobrium."

It might seem that the poor word has no friends at court. The Century, however, defines it as meaning *woman*, quoting Mandeville and Shakespeare but no modern authors, though the word ran riot in the nineteenth century. The Standard Dictionary says, "A person or animal of the female sex."

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 179, 180.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 234.

³ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 259.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 315.

This is certainly faint praise. In 1908, however, Lounsbury¹ defended the word very ardently. In his latest book on language, he gives the following facts as to the use of *female* in the literature:

Used by Wycliffe.

Used by Shakespeare eleven times.

Used occasionally by Fletcher and by Massinger.

Used at least eight times by Richard Steele.

Used frequently by Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett.

Used by Charles Lamb quite frequently and applied to his sister.

Used by Fanny Burney of the Princess Royal.

Used by Scott twelve times in one book.

Used by Bulwer very often; fourteen times in *Rienzi*.

Used by Dickens thirty-three times in *Pickwick Papers*.

Used by Thackeray twenty-one times in *Vanity Fair*.

Used by Irving, Disraeli, Hawthorne, George Eliot, and Trollope.

Used by Charles Reade at least twenty-one times in one book.

Used by Jane Austen speaking of herself.

Used by Elizabeth Barrett Browning.

The writer has seen the word in the following:

Seven Sages	1	Sterne	1
Shakespeare	5	Goldsmith	3
Pope	1	Gibbon	2
Matthew Prior	2	Lamb	9
Addison	16	Franklin	1
Swift	3	Hallam	1
Fielding	15	Leigh Hunt	1
Smollett	12	Coleridge	1
Sheridan	1	Irving	1
Jane Austen	5	Scott	18
Dr. Johnson	1	Cooper	21
Boswell	7	Milman	2

¹*The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 212-239.

Poe	9	Holmes	7
Kingsley	1	Bulwer	6
Dean Trench	2	Motley	7
Sir William Hamilton.....	1	Lowell	1
Thackeray	8	George Meredith	8
Dickens	19	Price Collier	5
Hawthorne	2	H. N. Hudson.....	1
Macaulay	2	Frederic Harrison	1
Browning	1	Stevenson	1

The last six authors start the word pretty well into our own day.

The figures in the table tally with Lounsbury's in showing that the word was a popular one with Dickens, Thackeray, and Bulwer. We have seen from Lounsbury that the word was quite strong in Steele; the table shows that it was used by Pope, Prior, Addison, and Swift—showing that it was a word of good repute in the Augustan Age of our literature.

Again: we have seen that the word has good American usage in its favor, though it has never had as great vogue in America as in England.

Query: (1) When did the word fall into contempt as alleged by Hill and others quoted in the foregoing paragraphs? (2) Why all this prejudice against *female* as a noun? As an adjective it seems to have no enemies: we even tolerate Female Institutes, Female Orphan Asylums, Female Colleges, though these phrases are totally illogical. (3) Suppose we are writing tales after the manner of Irving or Addison and should wish to speak of a poor, pitiable person of the female sex and of unknown age,—viewing her from a distance—what word could we use if not *female*? For instance, “Near the altar, at the far end of the cathedral, I could barely discern a poor shivering ——, whom at first I took to be the aged widow of the old sexton, but who proved to be his daughter just passing into her early maidenhood.” Would “woman” do for the gap in this sentence? Certainly a word that fills a need in the language should not be ostracized; we may avoid

it whenever possible, but should not drive it out of the language.

Those who call *female* a perversion of language or a vulgarity are setting up their own private judgment against the usage of the great authors. While the author holds no brief for this word, he thinks it is much maligned and misrepresented by some writers of schoolbooks and some vehement verbalists.

To prove that *female* should not be driven from the language, we may quote a sentence from Macaulay: "Though in families the number of males and *females* differs widely, yet in great collections of human beings the disparity almost disappears." What other word could Macaulay have used?

The tables show that this word has declined in popularity since about 1875. This is possibly due to the hostility of the women of the higher classes, who resent being called *females*. Probably they and their teachers have been influenced by Richard Grant White and others, who have told them that this use of the word put them on a plane with she-cats, she-dogs, and other creatures of the brute creation.

Goldsmith (*Deserted Village*) says:

As some fair *female*, unadorned and plain,
Secure to please, *etc.*

What other word could be used in this passage?

Addison in *The Guardian* says, "In short, there was not a *female* within ten miles of them that was in possession of a gold watch, a pearl necklace, or a piece of Mechlin lace, but they examined her title to it." Here *female* includes both grown women and half-grown girls. Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall* says, "Zenobia is, perhaps, the only *female* whose superior genius broke through the servile indolence imposed on her sex by the climate and manners of Asia." Would *woman* be correct in this sentence? Milman says, "In all Arabian tribes, the brother is most deeply wounded by an

outrage on the chastity of the *females*.' Here we see that the word refers to all of the female sex that could possibly be brutally attacked.

Those who wish to drive this word out of the language would compel us to use several words to express our meaning in sentences like those quoted above.

XLVII

FIRST TWO OR TWO FIRST?

The phrases *first two* and *two first* are typical of a group composed of the ordinal and the cardinal; which should be placed first?

We may premise by saying that *first two* is much more common both in polite speech and in literature, so common that we need not raise any question as to its correctness. As to the other locution, however, a good many earnest people have always had serious doubts. But both have been called in question by an eminent grammarian. See below.

Genung,¹ while preferring *first two*, does not attack the other. Dean Alford tells us that he was criticized for using *three first* gospels; but he not only used it regularly in his books but also defended it valiantly in his *Queen's English*.² Baskervill and Sewell³ and Lounsbury⁴ say that *two first* is not only as correct as *first two* but older in the language. For *two first*, Baskervill and Sewell cite Addison, Smollett, Cowper, Gibbon, and Ruskin. Lounsbury cites Milton, Pope, Byron, Johnson, Gibbon, Burke, Defoe, and Moore.

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 315.

² Pp. 145 ff.

³ *English Grammar*, pp. 308, 309.

⁴ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 125-134, 144.

The writer has recorded the following passages in which the *two first* locution is used:

Jeremy Taylor	1	Macaulay	1
Addison	12	Dean Trench	4
Dr. Johnson	2	Stopford Brooke.....	1
Dr. Hugh Blair	7	Browning	1
Gibbon	1	W. D. Whitney	1
Thomas Warton	2	George Eliot	2
Coleridge	3	Poe	1
Southey	1	William Minto	7
Lamb	4	Saintsbury	2
William Hazlitt	6	W. E. Gladstone	1
Jane Austen	2	Tennyson	1
Christopher North	1	Kingsley	1
Landor	1	William Morris	1
Hallam	4	Dean Stanley	1
Sir William Hamilton.....	1	W. W. Skeat	2
Matthew Arnold	1		

Combining the three lists, we see that the locution *two first* has a continuous history in the literature from the days of Milton and Jeremy Taylor to the present. On the lists we find scholars, great prose stylists, poets, and faithful guardians of language. Some conscientious doubters will be reassured when they see the names of Addison, Burke, and Landor; some when they find the names of Ruskin, Gibbon, and Arnold; others, at seeing Dr. Blair and Minto, writers on style and purity; Trench, Alford, Whitney, Dr. Johnson, and Lounsbury, famous students of English.

A reasonable inference from the tables is that *two first*, etc., are much stronger in England than in America; indeed, that they might almost be called literary Britishisms.

It was said above that both *two first* and *first two* have been called in question. Bain,¹ the eminent Scotch grammarian, after quoting *seven first* from Gibbon, says, "This is hardly to be imitated; no more can we commend 'the first seven'

¹ *Composition Grammar*, p. 306.

centuries!" "Better avoid the form altogether," says Bain, "and say, 'For seven centuries (from the first) the history was a succession of triumphs.'" What an awkward and circuitous expression, merely to avoid two locutions well established in the language! If Bain does this, what can we expect of "the lesser grammarians" who have been gagging and binding us? Is it not time to appeal unto Caesar, the great authors who constitute our supreme tribunal? At least thirty-five of them have handed in their opinion and many others could be cited. As typical of standard usage the following passages may be added: Matthew Arnold (*On Translating Homer*) says, "there is something in style which the *four first* have in common, and which the last is without." Dean Stanley says, "In the Appendix to the *two last* lectures will be found various original documents." Browning (*Andrea Del Sarto*) says,

the *three first* without a wife,
While I have mine.

Lamb, in a letter to Coleridge, says, "my grandmother . . . lived housekeeper in a family the *fifty or sixty last* years of her life." W. D. Whitney (*Language and the Study of Language*) says, "either, as in the case of the *two last*, the etymology is trivial or obscure, or, as in the case of the first, it is within reach only of the learned." De Quincey (*Lake Poets*) says, "on the contrary, the *first two* occasions on which . . . I became aware of his possible ill-humor and peevishness, were so public," etc.

Those who say *first two*, *last three*, etc., will be in no danger of criticism, while the use of the other locution may stir up opposition in some quarters, though it has very high authority.

XLVIII

FIRSTLY

Of *firstly*, Webster says, "Improperly used for *first!*" Quackenbos¹ puts it in his list of barbarisms. A. S. Hill² calls it a vulgarism and puts it on an equality with *muchly* and *thusly*, although these two have no standing at all either in literature or in polite society, while *firstly* was used by some of his most distinguished contemporaries in their writings. Herriek and Damon treat it as a barbarism. It is condemned by Genung in his school Rhetoric.³ De Quincey says, "I detest it." Walter Savage Landor said, "It is not English," although a number of his most eminent fellow-authors used it pretty frequently.

With seven such authorities arrayed against it, the chances for *firstly* would seem very slight; but there are some that tolerate it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Mary Wortley Montagu, Scott, and Gladstone. It is recognized by the Standard Dictionary; by the Century, quoting Sylvester's *Du Bartas*. Professor O. F. Emerson⁴ recognizes it as a "coming word." Lounsbury,⁵ that staunch friend of abused locutions, defends it. In refutation of De Quincey's charge that *firstly* was a neologism, Lounsbury says that the word goes back to the sixteenth century. (The writer may add here that it is used by Heywood in 1562.) He goes on to say that it has been used to some extent in every century from the sixteenth to the present. He cites the following authors as using it: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Byron, Scott, Dickens, Charlotte Brontë, Thackeray, Kingsley, Trollope, Carlyle, Gladstone, Kipling. It is recognized by Mätzner, the eminent

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 231.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 257.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 315.

⁴ *History of the English Language*, p. 268.

⁵ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 116-118, 119.

German grammarian and etymologist; by Henry Bradley,¹ the distinguished English lexicographer; and by Worcester's Dictionary. It is used by Jespersen, the eminent English scholar, who of course regards it as good English.

The author has seen *firstly* in the following:

Byron	1	Charlotte Brontë	2
Dickens	8	Encyc. Brit. (11th ed.).....	1
Sir William Hamilton	3	George Meredith	1
Churton Collins	2		

The writer has seen no case in American literature; but O. F. Emerson,² one of our best scholars, says of it, "A good example of a word even now in the process of change is the adverb *first*, which, under the influence of *secondly*, *thirdly*, and others of the series, constantly tends to become *firstly*."

The scholar need not be told that Professor Emerson in the foregoing paragraph is discussing analogy; but, for the benefit of some not so well informed, it may be added that it is perfectly natural, or analogical, for *first* to develop the adverbial ending *-ly* so long associated with numerous adverbs of its class.

Two facts should be clearly stated in connection with *firstly*: (1) It is less used by reputable speakers and standard authors than *first*. (2) Although *firstly* has some very high authority, it is not thoroughly established, especially in American literature.

The following passages will show how reputable authors use the word: Byron, writing to his wife, says, "I burned your last note for two reasons: *firstly*, it was written in a style not very agreeable; and *secondly* . . ." Churton Collins (*Studies in Shakespeare*) says, "*Firstly*, he must have a fine ear for rhythm, and thorough knowledge of Elizabethan prosody." Sir William Hamilton says, "*Firstly*, that the collegial body (Fellows and Head) was not in general constituted by capacity and learning."

¹ *The Making of English*, p. 135.

² *History of the English Language*, p. 268.

XLIX

FOREIGN PLURALS ANGLICIZED

In discussing *memorandums*, Carpenter,¹ the grammarian, expresses the hope that words like *memorandum*, *bandit*, etc., will soon take on English plurals exclusively. No doubt the wretched children in our schools will shout his praises.

While thinking over such matters, the writer saw *rendezvouses* in Dean Swift and *serieses* in Dr. Johnson. Some may welcome these forms and the facts given in connection with *memorandums* as prognosticating a movement—however slow—in the direction of ridding our grammars of the long list of foreign plurals that constitutes such a bugbear in the schoolroom. How long shall our children groan under this burden? How long shall *errata*, *criteria*, *radii*, *genera*, and other jaw-breaking foreign plurals drive our children to madness? Even our great Prayer Book compilers wrote in desperation, “*Cherubims* and *seraphims* continually do cry”; and the children may well do likewise.

L

GOTTEN

Some years ago, *gotten* came under the ban of some lexicographers and some professors of rhetoric. The present writer, not having studied the word closely, was affected by this clamor and adopted *got* to the exclusion of *gotten*. Others may have had a like experience.

Webster and Worcester both call *gotten* “obsolescent.” A. S. Hill² says, “no longer in good use in England. In

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 56.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 147.

America it is sometimes found in authors of repute, but the current of the best usage is against it." Baskervill and Sewell,¹ generally safe in their statements, say, "The form *gotten* is little used, *got* being the preferred form." The New English (Oxford) Dictionary says *got* (*gotten*), and adds: "In England the form *gotten* is almost obsolete except dialectically, being superseded by *got*; in U. S. literature *gotten* is still very common, although Webster, 1864, gives it as obsolescent." A well-known American professor of literature is quoted as saying recently that, in England, *gotten* is almost as obsolete as *putten*. This is utterly preposterous. *Putten* has been obsolete for hundreds of years, but *gotten* is found in some of the best books published in England in the last few years, and is recognized as better than *got* by several recent grammarians of Great Britain. (See list below.)

In 1776 George Campbell defended *gotten*, preferring it to *got*. Richard Grant White,² usually very prone to attack any word at all questionable, makes a strong argument for it and uses it in his books. The Century recognizes it, with passages from the Bible, Baker, Sidney, and John Evelyn. The Standard says, "*Got* or *gotten*." Lounsbury³ in his two books on language puts it as one of the participles of *get*. In addition to the champions named above, the following scholars recognize it in their grammars, or other books:

First choice: Richard Morris, Alexander Bain, Whitney, C. P. Mason, John Earle; second choice: Carpenter, Meiklejohn, Krapp, and O. F. Emerson.

Kittredge and Farley⁴ in 1913 said, "Many good speakers also use it instead of the past participle *got*, but *got* is the accepted modern form."

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 159.

² *Words and Their Uses*, p. 118.

³ *History of the English Language*, pp. 335, 337, 393, and *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 61.

⁴ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 293, note 1.

Gotten is used by the following:

William Caxton	1	Scott	2
William Dunbar	1	Christopher North.....	1
Malory	8	Poe	2
King James Bible ¹	20	Hawthorne	1
Hugh Latimer	11	Kingsley	2
Prayer Book	2	Thomas Hughes	3
Francis Bacon	11	Thomas Moore.....	1
Ben Jonson	1	Swinburne	4
Shakespeare	5	Wendell Phillips	1
Sir Thomas Browne.....	1	Richard Grant White.....	3
Rolls House MSS.....	1	Morris	2
Sackville	1	W. D. Whitney.....	7
Marlowe	4	H. W. Mabie.....	1
Spenser	2	Thomas Nelson Page.....	4
Lyly	1	Dean Church	1
Fuller	3	Browning	1
Jeremy Taylor	1	Stevenson	3
Clarendon	2	Sidney Lanier	1
Defoe	8	Dean Trrench	6
Swift	2	Stopford Brooke.....	1
John Evelyn.....	1	John Earle	3
Dr. Johnson	1	John Burroughs	1
Fielding	4	G. W. Cable	1
Lamb	2	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1
George Campbell	6		

In addition to the dictionaries and the eminent grammarians quoted above as supporting *gotten*, we have cited over fifty "reputable authors" that have been using the form for five hundred years down to the present. How could it be called obsolescent?

Another thing in favor of *gotten* is euphony; it is often less abrupt and less jerky in the sentence. For instance, take a passage from the Psalms²: "his right hand, and his holy arm, hath *gotten* him the victory" (King James version); "With his own right hand and with his holy arm hath he *gotten*

¹ Cruden probably omitted fifty or more cases.

² Ps. 98.1 in Bible; 98.2 in Prayer Book.

himself the victory" (Prayer Book version). Change *gotten* to *got* in these passages and note the loss in cadence and melody. Are not both passages seriously injured?

In polite society in large parts of America, the longer form has wide vogue in spite of some popular dictionaries.

On the list of authors using *gotten*, we find White, Trench, Whitney, and Earle, four faithful guardians of the language. Whitney, who uses it at least seven times in his books, had no doubt heard it all his life in New England; the writer has heard it all his life in Virginia. These facts would indicate that the form is strong in the old states of America.

Hill, as said above, tells us in 1902 that *gotten* is no longer in good use in England. This in spite of the fact that several eminent recent grammarians of England and Scotland give it full recognition and that it was used by Swinburne, Thomas Hughes, Dean Trench, William Morris, Thackeray, Dean Church, Stopford Brooke, Professor John Earle, Browning, Robert Louis Stevenson, and Charles Kingsley, all contemporaries of Professor Hill. As to Hill's statement that *gotten* is "sometimes" used by authors of repute in America, the reader is referred to the table above, in which eight of Hill's American contemporaries are cited as using it more or less frequently.

Kittredge and Farley, quoted above, were nearer right than Hill. Their statement, with a slight modification, will put the case succinctly and exactly: "Many good speakers (and authors) also use it instead of the past participle *got*, but *got* is the accepted modern form."

Stevenson in the *Master of Ballantrae* says, "'Of course, this is midsummer madness?' said Sir William, so soon as we were *gotten* out of hearing." Again, in his *Silverado Squatters*, he says, "The sun had now *gotten* much higher." Would *got* be tolerated in either of these sentences?

LI

GRADUATE AS AN ACTIVE VERB

The phrase "Brown *graduated*" was on the forbidden list of William Cullen Bryant while editing the *Evening Post*: every writer must say "was graduated." Genung,¹ though not so outspoken, does not like the first-named phrase.

The Century recognizes the active form, quoting the *London Monthly Magazine* (1808). The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Macaulay. Webster recognizes it, quoting Latham and Macaulay. The Standard and Worcester recognize it.

Out of thirty-four articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, thirty-three use *graduated*, which shows that the active form is used regularly in England. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Southey, Marryat, the *Times*, and some minor writers.

Appleton's *Encyclopædia of Biography*, however, uses the passive form in thirty-nine out of forty articles examined; but this may be due to the preference of the editors-in-chief, as American usage is certainly not overwhelmingly in favor of the passive.

As all the passages the writer has noted are unsigned, we may borrow from the dictionaries. Macaulay is quoted as saying, "He was brought to their bar, and asked where he *had graduated*." Latham says: "He *graduated* at Oxford." "Where did you *graduate*?" is, it would seem, the regular academic phrase in America, and no doubt in England.

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 316.

LII

GRATEFUL — PLEASANT

I presume that you have many titles whereof some are more *grateful* to your ears than others. (*Bulwer.*)

The word *grateful* as used by Bulwer in this sentence has been questioned by Genung¹ in his well-known textbook for schools. He says, "sometimes unnecessarily used for 'pleasant'—a Latin meaning." The writer had always been accustomed to the phrase "grateful odor," and had no idea that it was open to question.

Worcester and the Standard recognize *grateful*=pleasant. The Century recognizes it, quoting Shirley, Pope, and Bancroft. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, with passages from Pope, Churchill, Goldsmith, Scott, Argyll, and others less known. Webster recognizes it, quoting Pope. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, with a quotation from Longfellow.

The writer has seen the word once each in the writings of Thomas Burnet and of Bulwer; twice in Milman; seven times in Bryant. *Ungrateful*=unpleasant occurs once in Poe, H. N. Hudson, Longfellow, and Arlo Bates. Hudson says, "But the sorrow can hardly be *ungrateful* to us, that has such noble comforters as Antonio's."

The usage of great English authors from the Elizabethan period to our own day proves that the locution has had wide vogue in England; the names of Bancroft, Hudson, and Bryant prove its use in New England. Poe, though a cosmopolitan, represents "the Virginia dialect."

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 316.

LIII

GROW SMALL

Genning, in an earlier edition¹ of his school textbook, condemned the phrase *grow small*, but, under the advice of friends and critics, withdrew his opposition. As Genning's original position probably represented the feeling of others, and as his first edition no doubt influenced a good many people against the locution, it is worth discussing.

The verb *grow* began, about A.D. 1440, to take on the meaning of "become," supplanting the old word *wax*, so familiar to Bible readers and to those who have sung the line,

Till moons shall *wax* and wane no more.

"His eye *waxed* not dim", "he *waxed* rich," etc., used to be common in the language and literature. *Wax* became obsolescent and *grow* took its place. As early as the period 1558-1593, we find the phrase, "Money is *growing* due." (Tarlton's *Jests*.)

The Century Dictionary recognizes *grow* in the meaning of "become." In polite circles we constantly hear such phrases as "grow rich", "grow fat", "growing thinner and thinner", "growing younger and younger", "growing beautifully less," etc.

In the King James Bible, we find, "they doubted whereunto this would *grow*." In the Greek version this *grow* is represented by *γίγνομαι* (*gignomai*), which means "become" = Latin *feri*. Beza's Latin text has *evasurum esset* = would become, turn out. The German Bible has *werden wollte*, where of course *werden* means "to become." By these passages we wish to show that *grow* in the English Bible means "to become" (1611).

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1893, p. 315.

Grow small, grow thin, grow wise, etc., then, are analogical phrases, in which *grow* has given up its original meaning and has become a copulative verb meaning "become."

LIV

HAD RATHER

In the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, *had rather* was in great vogue in our literature. In 1755, however, Dr. Johnson in his dictionary attacked it furiously, calling it "a barbarism of late intrusion into our language." (But he used it once in *Rasselas*.) About twenty-five years later, Sheridan attacked it in his dictionary. Another very warm opponent was Bishop Lowth (died 1787), one of the earliest defenders of the purity of English speech. Of course the English and Americans of that period became prejudiced against *had rather*; whom could they trust in matters of English if not their lexicographers, Johnson and Sheridan, and their pioneer in verbal criticism, the great bishop of London? At this very time, George Campbell was a distinguished scholar and theologian in Scotland. In his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, which was published in 1776 and has exerted an immense influence, he condemned *had rather* in the most unequivocal manner.

Webster, in his dictionary, joined in the clamor against *had rather*, and the phrase really had no friends at this period. About 1867, Richard Grant White,¹ the most ardent student of usage among the literati of America, and Dean Alford,² who was regarded as a high authority by thousands in England, made a practically simultaneous onslaught upon *had rather*.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, 1867, p. 417.

² *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 94, 95.

All of these men were thoroughly conscientious. They were also zealous and jealous for the purity of the language. But they were all arguing from false premises: they thought *had rather* was wrong because they could not explain it syntactically. As they could explain *would rather*, they wished to drive *had rather* out and substitute *would rather*.

At last the skies brightened for the much-abused *had rather*. A. S. Hill,¹ professor of rhetoric at Harvard, who began publishing textbooks in 1878, admitted that *had rather* was "as good" as *would rather*. He was a friend in need and a friend indeed. About this time, W. J. Rolfe gave it a helping hand. In his edition of the *Merchant of Venice*,² he says: "*Had rather* and *had better* are good English, though many writers of grammars tell us that we should say *would rather*, etc., instead." About the same time E. A. Abbott,³ the great grammarian, recognized *had rather* as a good idiom and explained it syntactically. Quackenbos⁴ called it "idiomatic" but anomalous." (Are not most idioms anomalous?) The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Sidney, Shakespeare, Dekker, and Cowper. Webster recognizes it, citing passages from the King James Bible and Shakespeare. Whitney, the eminent linguist, in his *Essentials of English Grammar*,⁵ recognized *had rather* and explained its idiomatic origin (1885). This was of course a great help, as Whitney's opinion would have great weight with all scholars engaged in writing grammars or compiling dictionaries. Another strong champion of *had rather* was Fitzedward Hall, who, though born in America, spent most of his life in England and knew the usage of both countries better than most men. In his *Modern English* (1873) and in his articles in the learned journals, he defended *had rather* against gram-

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, pp. 15, 16.

² Old edition, p. 132.

³ *How to Parse*, p. 225.

⁴ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 235.

⁵ P. 219.

marians who condemned it because they could not parse it. The New English Dictionary defends *had rather* and refers to Hall's article in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. II, pp. 281 ff. This dictionary says, "Idiomatic but late," quoting passages from the *Paston Letters*, Lord Berners, Sidney, and Marryat. By "late" the New English Dictionary means that *had rather* supplanted some earlier locutions occurring frequently in Chaucer, Malory, and other ancient authors. In 1894, Jespersen¹ said, "*Had rather* is used by the best authors, by Shakespeare at least some sixty times, while *would rather* is comparatively rare in his writings." He also quotes a prominent Dutch scholar as saying that historically the *had* form is the better. In 1901, Greenough and Kittredge² defended *had rather* and explained it syntactically. In 1908, Lounsbury³ defended it strenuously. About the same time, Nesfield,⁴ the well-known grammarian, put it among "well established idioms." In 1913, Kittredge and Farley⁵ in their grammar said, "the idiom is well established."

If the facts stated above do not convince the doubters, they would not be persuaded though Shakespeare and Addison rose from the dead to argue with them.

The influence of Johnson, Lowth, Campbell and such men lives on. Richard Grant White's books are still published in new and attractive form, carrying conviction to the layman. The lukewarm toleration of popular textbooks by such well known men as Hill and Genung affects the intelligent masses to some extent. It is necessary, therefore, that the statements of our great scholars be iterated and reiterated in volumes like this. Lounsbury, for instance, in his able defense of *had rather* tells us that it is used "scores of times" by Shakespeare; at least fifteen times by Fielding; at least four times

¹ *Progress in Language*, p. 226, note.

² *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 205.

³ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 281-289.

⁴ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 201.

⁵ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 123.

by Jane Austen; at least seven times by Oliver Wendell Holmes—the last three authors using it in spite of the prejudice against it created by the eminent scholars named at the beginning of this paragraph.

The reader may possibly have been led to believe that *had rather* is not older than Shakespeare; but that is not true. Some scholars tell us that it originated, “apparently” or probably, in the sixteenth century; but this is indefinite. The earliest case the present writer has seen is in Lord Berners’s translation of Froissart, published about 1523; the next, in *Ralph Roister Doister*, written probably about 1550. It had probably been in colloquial speech before 1500. Shakespeare uses it frequently; the King James translators, rarely.¹ *Had lever*, so common in Chaucer, survived to some extent in the literature, certainly to the days of Sir Thomas More. In the *Nut-Brown Maid* (about 1500) we read,

yet *had* I *lever* than
That I had too the grenewod goo, alone, a banysshyd man.

In More’s *Heresies*, we read, “and *had lever* pay for it to the printer, than have it of the bishop free.”

Would rather the writer has seen once in Chaucer, *had rather*, never. Sir Thomas More in *Heresies* says, “then *woulde* I *rather* have used such moderation as I speake of.” So that “me were lever”, “I hadde lever”, “I had lever”, “I would rather” are presumably all older than I *had rather*.

Had rather can be found in the following authorities:

Lord Berners.....	1	Massinger	2
Ralph Roister Doister.....	2	Two Noble Kinsmen.....	2
Thersytes	1	Sir Thomas Browne.....	6
Latimer	4	Beaumont and Fletcher.....	1
Shakespeare ²	23	Marlowe	2
King James Bible.....	2	Bacon	2

¹ Only twice as far as the present writer has noticed.

² The author has not searched Shakespeare, but recorded the cases actually seen in his reading. There are at least 60 cases of it.

Sidney	3	Cowper	1
John Lyly	3	Lamb	11
Thomas Randolph	1	Gaskell	2
Baxter	1	Sir Henry Taylor	1
Dryden	1	Longfellow	2
Steele	1	Holmes	1
Johnson	1	Emerson	1
Burke	1	Thackeray	1
Jefferson	1	Browning	1
John Adams	2	Kittredge and Greenough.....	1

This is not a very strong showing for four hundred years: it shows what effect vehement attacks have upon a locution.

The attacks made upon *had rather* led some of the best authors to take refuge in the use of *had better*; but this is a miserable substitute, as we lose the meaning carried by *rather*. Jefferson fell back upon *would rather*: he was no doubt influenced by Campbell, Webster, and others. That many authors were driven off from the phrase under discussion can be seen from the table above: before the attacks made by the scholars named, *had rather* shows 51 examples; after the attacks, 25 examples.

How any man reading the great authors could join in the onslaught upon *had rather* is amazing. It occurs in Shakespeare frequently; e. g.,

I *had rather* be a dog, and bay the moon,
Than such a Roman.

Also in equally familiar passages in the Bible: "I *had rather* be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, etc."; and in the Prayer Book version of the same psalm (84:11), where it is read by untold thousands. Dr. Johnson, though he attacked the phrase, used it in *Rasselas*: "This," said the prince, "I do not understand, but I *had rather* hear thee than dispute. Continue thy narration."

In America, Henry Clay has long been quoted as saying, "I *had rather* be right than be president." Both *had rather*

and *would rather* are used in polite circles: the great mass of refined people *will* use the old phrases in conversation even if authors are timid about using them.

Colloquially, in easy English, we often say, "I'd rather."

For the benefit of readers that have not ready access to the books in which *had rather* is syntactically explained, the author will say: One word that baffled all the early grammarians was *had*; they did not imagine that it could be a preterite subjunctive equivalent to *would hold* (consider). Again: they did not dream that *rather* was the comparative degree of the old adjective *rathe*, so common in earlier periods of English. Now we know that the sentence "I *had rather* work than play" means, "I should hold or regard working a better thing than playing."

LV

HAVE GOT FOR HAVE

In some books and among some good teachers, *have got* for *have* has no standing. Professor A. S. Hill¹ in his school Rhetoric, says, "*Got* is redundant when it expresses an idea already expressed in *have*." Quaekenbos² calls it superfluous. Genung³ says, "not to be used with *have* in the sense of possession. . . . When used, it should convey the sense of obtaining." Richard Grant White⁴ was strong in his condemnation and gave the phrase a bad name with many people. The Century says, "used colloquially."

If left to the purists and the pedants, this locution would be left no ground to stand on. Let us turn to the linguists for their opinions. Kellner,⁵ the English scholar of Vienna, says:

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 236.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 235.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 316.

⁴ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 117, 118.

⁵ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 229.

"It is worth remarking that Modern English has produced a sort of Preteritive Verb (Preterite in form but Present in meaning) similar to Greek *οἶδ* + Latin, *novi*, Old English *wât*, etc., namely the idiom *have got* = have. . . . *Very frequent in familiar speech.*"¹ Here is a prominent scholar, an expert in English syntax, setting forth clearly this phrase as a new development in the English language. (He uses it himself in his *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*.)

In a standard volume² of which Kellner and Henry Bradley are the joint revisers, the same treatment of *have got* was inserted by these scholars in 1895, though Dr. Richard Morris did not have it in the original edition.

Jespersen³ puts *have got* (=have) among the phrases adopted by Shakespeare from the vernacular. So that we have three of the best European English scholars recognizing this locution and one of them using it himself in a book.

The writer may add that he has not seen this *have got* in Shakespeare, though he may use it.

Besides being recognized by Bradley, Kellner, and Jespersen, *have got* is used by the following writers and speakers of repute:

Goldsmith	1	D. G. Mitchell.....	3
Lamb	2	Ruskin	1
Thomas Hood	2	Holmes	2
Carlyle	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1
Thackeray	3	L. Kellner	1
A. H. Clough.....	1	Dickens	1
Gladstone	1		

If names count, *have got* should have some standing and not be branded as a vulgarism. Moreover, it is used too widely in polite society to be so treated. George Eliot uses it frequently in conversations, showing that she considered

¹ The italics are mine.

² *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, 1903, p. 267.

³ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 223.

it good colloquial English, though she is not in the list of authors cited as using it *in propria persona*. Goldsmith uses it in conversations: "Can you lie three in a bed? No. Then you will never do for a school. *Have you got* a good stomach? Yes. Then you will by no means do for a school." Thackeray uses it in the *Roundabout Papers*, which are written in a semi-colloquial style. Lamb uses it in the conversational passages of his *Origin of Roast Pig*. Donald G. Mitchell, in his *Reveries of a Bachelor* and his *Dream Life*, says: "I *have got* a quiet farmhouse in the country," and "you know the other boy *has got* no father."

Prominent philologists regard *have got* as worthy of explanation. A fine scholar suggested in his university lecture room that, as most people like the idea of possession, English added *got* to make this idea more vivid. Dr. C. P. G. Scott, in an address before the American Philological Association, recognized "I got it" (=I have it) as a new verb phrase emerging in recent English. Those two scholars did not denounce *have got* as a vulgarism.

Going back to the opening of the last paragraph. If most people like the idea of possession, and if *have* has been used so much as an auxiliary that the idea of possession has faded considerably, did *got* come in to reinforce the *have*? Possibly this is the psychology of the phrase.

It is worth noting that, in expressing obligation or necessity, e. g., "I've *got* to go," *got* seems to meet with less objection than when expressing ownership.

Dean Alford, who draws distinctions between dignified and free-and-easy discourse,¹ might say, "When delivering a serious discourse, I say *have*; but, when talking informally, I say *have got*."

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 49.

LVI

HEIGHTH (HIGHTH) FOR HEIGHT

The writer has heard the form *heighth* so often in some of the old states that he watched it in the literature.

Most of the dictionaries call it obsolete or provincial. The New English Dictionary says, "The *-th* forms are still affected by some." Lowell says that it is often heard in New England; the writer has often heard it from refined people of New York and Virginia. It would be a provincialism if it were not used in so many parts of America and could not be found in pretty recent literature.

Every reader of *Paradise Lost* will recall several cases of *hight* in the first two books; for instance,

No wonder, fallen such a pernicious *hight*.

Again, in *Samson Agonistes*:

The secret wrested from me in her *hight*
Of nuptial love professed,

Yet towards these, thus dignified, thou oft
Amidst their *hight* of noon,

It is found in Bacon, Hakluyt, Thomas Warton, and Walter Savage Landor. The last-named author, in his *Imaginary Conversations*, says, "Midas in the *hight* of prosperity would have given his daughter to Lycaon," etc.

The word should be marked "rare in the literature"; but "obsolete or provincial" is too drastic.

Heighth is the original form; *height*, a corruption though now more usual.

LVII

I AM MISTAKEN, ETC.

Two prominent rhetorical scholars¹ in their textbooks condemn "*If I am not mistaken*" and all other forms of this locution, and say, "*If I mistake not*" should be used. These professors of rhetoric were continuing a fight which has been going on for a long time against these phrases. In 1864, Dean Alford² had to deal with predecessors of these two scholars. He said, in reply to them, that the phrases were "rooted in the language and had become idiomatic." He added that a man who insisted upon saying "*If I mistake not*" showed that he was "under the influence of the lesser grammarians" and was not influenced by "the usages of society." The *Century* recognizes these locutions; also *mistaken* as an adjective equivalent to "in error," quoting Shakespeare and Daniel Webster. Worcester, Webster, and the *Standard* are on the same side. The *Encyclopedic Dictionary* recognizes it, quoting Shakespeare. Henry Sweet³ defends the locution, treating *mistaken* as a preterite passive participle used in an active sense. Nesfield⁴ says that *you were mistaken* is according to idiom, while *you mistook it* is against idiom.

The writer has found no recent opponents of the phrases besides the two already referred to. One of these concedes that *you are mistaken* is common in Beaumont and Fletcher.

These phrases are found in the following reputable authors:

Shakespeare ⁵	1	Milton	2
Samuel Butler	1	Congreve	1
Cowley	1	Matthew Prior	1

¹ Genung in *Outlines of Rhetoric*, edition of 1893, but he modified his statement in 1900. Quackenbos in his *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, says "Not so elegant as '*If I mistake not*.'"

² *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 105, 106.

³ *New English Grammar*, part II, p. 125.

⁴ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 210.

⁵ The concordance to Shakespeare shows several other cases.

Fielding	6	Macaulay	6
Jane Austen	1	Dean Trench.....	1
Franklin	2	W. D. Whitney.....	2
Thomas Jefferson	2	Edward Fitzgerald.....	1
Richardson	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1
Poe	13	Henry Drummond.....	1
Holmes	2	John Fiske.....	2
Bulwer	3	Stevenson	1
Huxley	1	Saintsbury	2

From the foregoing paragraphs we see that *I am mistaken* has been standard English from the time of Beaumont and Fletcher to the present. The names of Whitney and Trench should carry weight with those who care for the custodians of purity; the other names will influence those who value the usage of well-known authors not specialists in language.

As to the adjectival use of *mistaken*, as meaning "in error," the writer has the following statistics:

Shakespeare	2	Lamb	1
Pope	1	De Quincey.....	1
Baxter	2	Hallam	1
Prior	1	G. W. Cable.....	1
Swift	1	Sidney Lanier	1
Dr. Johnson.....	2	Lowell	1

Polite usage would seem to be almost universally in favor of *he was mistaken*, etc., and *mistaken man*, etc.

Again we see some of the writers on usage fighting an idiom established in polite society and in literature.

Olipphant¹ says that *you are mistaken* was coming in about 1660 instead of *you mistook*. He finds it in Wycherley. Our table tallies with this statement. But see the quotations from Quackenbos above.

On the negative, then, we have two rhetorical scholars; on the affirmative, ten authorities in usage and twenty-four makers of usage, besides "the usage of society." The reader can draw his own conclusions.

¹ *The New English*, II, 107.

The following sentences will show how these locutions are used by some of the great authors. Milton in his *Arcopagitica* says, "they *may be mistaken* in the choice of a licenser as easily as this licenser *may be mistaken* in an author." Whitney in *Language and the Study of Language* says, "These considerations, if I *am not mistaken*, will be found," etc. Again: "those *are greatly mistaken* who imagine that the beginnings of speech," etc. Prior uses the adjective:

But you and I in Homer read
Of gods, as well as men, *mistaken*.

Prior has two poems entitled *Cupid Mistaken* and *Venus Mistaken*. Huxley says, "He *may have been mistaken*." Stevenson says, "I had my own reasons for thinking that the stranger *was mistaken*."

LVIII

I PRESUME = I DARE SAY, BELIEVE, ETC.

Presume in the meaning of *dare say* is condemned mildly in Genung's school rhetoric. Genung¹ will not permit us to say, "I *presume* you have heard so and so"; we must put it, "I *presume to say* you have heard so and so." Does anybody ever use that language?

The Century Dictionary recognizes the phrase, quoting Shakespeare, Sheridan, and two minor authors. Webster recognizes it, quoting Milton and Sir William Blackstone. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Blackstone. The Standard and Worcester recognize it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, with quotations from William Robertson and Sir John Lubbock.

The writer has seen this phrase in Shakespeare, Chesterfield, Hallam, Byron, and Bulwer. Sheridan as quoted by the Cen-

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 325.

tury, says in *The Rivals*, "Yes, sir, I *presume* you would not wish me to quit the army?" Byron says, "Did Mr. Bowles ever gaze upon the sea? I *presume* he has at least upon a sea-piece." Who would change to "I presume to say," etc.?

Here we have five authorities and ten reputable authors on one side and one reputable professor of rhetoric on the other.

I presume is widely used in polite society.

LIX

I TAKE IT = I UNDERSTAND, SUPPOSE

George Campbell in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776), regards *I take it* as only a little better than some "vile but common phrases" he is discussing.

Dean Alford¹ defends it, and says that the expulsion of this phrase would be a loss to the language. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, and quotes a passage from Sheridan. Nesfield² says, "This is a common phrase for 'in my opinion.'"³ Oliphant³ says it was coming in about 1470; he also quotes a passage from Fanny Burney, about 1782. Webster and Worcester recognize it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Shakespeare, the *Tatler*, and Tennyson.

While the phrase is not very common in the literature, it is found in the following writers:

Wycliffe	1	Dean Alford ..	1
Marlowe	1	Poe	1
Shakespeare	3	Carlyle	1
Massinger	3	H. N. Hudson	3
Congreve	2	Browning	3
Swift	1	Fitzedward Hall.....	1
Dryden	1	Thackeray	1
Lamb	7	Earl of Derby	1

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 230, 231.

² *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 263.

³ *The New English*, I, 322; II, 190.

Matthew Arnold.....	1	Saintsbury	2
Henry Drummond	1	George Herbert Palmer.....	1
Lowell	1	Dr. Henry van Dyke....	1
Holmes	1	Price Collier.....	2
Huxley	2	Stevenson	1
Tennyson	1	Ernest Rhys	1
Stedman	1		

The phrase has high authority and good platform usage in its favor. It occurs several times in the writings of Otto Jespersen, which proves that he has learned it as good English.

Dean Swift (*Conversation*) says, "By these means the poets, for many years past, were all overrun with pedantry. For, as *I take it*, the word is not properly used," etc. Tennyson in *Edwin Morris* makes the curate say,

I take it, God made the woman for the man.

Stedman, the poet and critic, says, "Subjective work is judged to be inferior, *I take it*, from its morbid examples." (*Nature and Elements of Poetry*.) Carlyle (*Heroes*) says, "For, as *I take it*, Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is," etc. Dr. Henry van Dyke in his *Poetry of Tennyson* says, "The art of landscape-poetry, *I take it*, consists in this," etc. Browning says,

But she and her son agreed, *I take it*,
That, etc.

LX

IMMENSE AND IMMENSELY

Is it slangy to say, "I like that *immensely*"?

Greenough and Kittredge¹ discuss the adjective *immense* as a slang word; no doubt it is slangy in many cases. When, however, we find it in James Parton's *Life of Burr*, "This young gentleman . . . had an *immense* opinion of Burr's tal-

¹ *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 313.

ents," shall we call it slangy? Dr. Henry van Dyke in a baccalaureate sermon at Harvard in 1898 said, "Now, . . . it was an *immense* compliment for the disciples to be spoken to in this way" (by Christ). Charles Lamb, writing to Coleridge about a book, says, "I like it *immensely*." Of course he was using it in an easy, epistolary style, but slang is slang. The Century Dictionary defines *immensely* as "exceedingly," but gives no example from the literature. Fielding, Chesterfield, Macaulay, and George Eliot use the two forms.

Of course "*immense* building", "*immense* fortune," etc., are used continually; but "*immense* compliment", "*immense* opinion," etc., are much rarer in literature. However, it is very common for a word to pass from the physical to the psychical sense; and this word is simply moving in accordance with this principle.

Morton Luee, a distinguished critic of England, says, "We admired Sims Reeves *immensely*, but we hoped never to hear him sing that song again." This is exactly like Lamb's use of the adverb. Fielding, speaking of Jonathan Wild, says, "His avarice was *immense*."

LXI

IMPLICIT CONFIDENCE

Genung¹ condemns the phrase *implicit confidence*. "*Implicit*," he says, "not to be used in the sense of 'unlimited.' . . . *Implicit* is properly opposed to *explicit*,—literally, infolded in contrast to unfolded." Here is "the evil spirit of derivation," not permitting a word to cut loose from its etymology and extend its meaning.

The Century Dictionary recognizes *implicit* in the sense of unquestioning and quotes *implicit faith* from Dr. John Brown.

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 317.

Worcester, the Standard, and Webster all recognize it, the last named giving the phrases *implicit confidence* and *implicit obedience*, and quoting *implicit faith* from John Donne. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, and quotes *implicit believing* from Bishop Burnet. The Oxford Dictionary recognizes it, with quotations from the literature.

The writer has seen *implicit faith* in Butler, Gibbon, Lamb, Hallam, and Poe; *implicit confidence* in Jane Austen, Sir John Lubbock, and Professor Lounsbury; *implicit reliance* in Poe and Dickens; *implicitly credited* in Huxley; *trusted implicitly* in the writings of Fitzedward Hall and Cunningham Geikie; *implicit obedience* in Hallam; *implicit belief* in Lamb. In polite colloquial English and in public discourse, the phrases cited above would seem to be almost universal.

Coleridge, in speaking of Shakespeare, says, "himself a nature humanized, a genial understanding devoting self-consciously a power and an *implicit wisdom* deeper even than our consciousness." This use of *implicit* is much rarer than the one under discussion.

Implicit faith and *implicit confidence* are standard phrases in the language and literature and refuse to be driven out.

Genung, then, seems unwarranted in his criticism of *implicit confidence* and other locutions involving the same meaning of the adjective; they are found in the best books and are used by the best speakers.

Samuel Butler in *Hudibras* says,

Whate'er the crabbed'st author hath
He understood by *implicit* faith.

Dr. C. Geikie, a prominent religious writer, says, "They . . . *trusted implicitly* that He who selected their nation to be His peculiar people would protect them and their country," etc. Dickens (*Pickwick Papers*) says, "he placed *implicit reliance* on the high-minded Job." Lounsbury says, "the generalizations contained in grammars in the shape of rules can fre-

quently not be received with *implicit confidence*, because they have been based upon insufficient data."

The distinction between *implicit* and *explicit* laid down by the textbook quoted at the beginning of this section is perfectly valid; but *implicit* has another meaning in the phrases *implicit confidence*, etc. A good illustration of the antithesis referred to above is seen in a sentence from *Adam Bede*: "Behind this *explicit* resolution there lay an *implicit* one."

LXII

IN OUR (THEIR, YOUR) MIDST

Quaakenbos¹ puts *in our midst* among his "everyday mis-usages" and says, "*In our midst* for *in the midst of us* is severely criticized on the ground that one cannot possess a midst, the English possessive, in its modern use, being almost exclusively limited to the notion of property (usage approves *a week's pay*). Old English writers used 'in the midst.'" (As to the statement about the possessive in modern English, see pp. 202 ff., below.) Genung² says, "It is better style to use the *of*-construction rather than the possessive, as, *in the midst of us, of them*." A. S. Hill³ says, "*In our midst* . . . is avoided by so many careful writers, and condemned by so many critics, that it may never fight its way into the accepted language." Webster says, "Avoided by some good writers."

One of the earliest modern champions of this locution was Fitzedward Hall,⁴ already referred to in this volume as the friend of the friendless. His defense of *in their midst*, etc., is approvingly quoted by the Century Dictionary, which adds, "These phrases have been objected to by some writers on

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, edition of 1896, p. 236.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 317.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, 1902, p. 50.

⁴ *Modern English*, pp. 48-51.

English, but with no good reason." Dr. Hall traces the phrase back to the fourteenth century. He finds an equivalent phrase of the same formation in a Wycliffite paper, written, he says, either by Wycliffe or by one of his contemporaries. This is the same phrase cited by T. L. K. Oliphant and referred to in a later paragraph of this section. This passage Hall uses to establish the antiquity of the phrase. He then argues that the phrase is perfectly analogical, and advises that any one who cannot bring himself to use it should "pass by on the other side and leave it to itself." (Dr. Hall's book is almost inaccessible, but his defense of *in our (their) midst* is quoted in the Century Dictionary under the word *midst*.) The New English Dictionary recognizes it, with quotations from James Montgomery, James Martineau, and James Bryce, and adds: "Scarcely found before the 19th century; the solitary example from the 16th century does not prove that it was current." The New English Dictionary failed to notice that the phrase was current in Anglo-Saxon and simply re-emerged in later periods of the language. (See *infra*.) The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes the locution but quotes no authors.

The group of words under discussion goes back to the Anglo-Saxon; it is used several times in the Anglo-Saxon gospels, and might be represented in modern English by *in their middle* (A.S. *middel*). This later became *middest* or *midst*. In the Middle English literature, we find *in her (=their) middes* and *on heora middele*, where *middes* and *middele*=modern *midst*, and *on*=modern *in*. This proves that the group under discussion is not a neologism but a very old locution. Again: the word *midst* has for hundreds of years been used as a noun in such phrases as "in the midst of us", "in the midst of the doctors," etc. A very natural step is to the phrases "in our midst," etc.

The Century Dictionary quotes "*In their midst* a form was seen" from James Montgomery. The writer has seen the locution once each in Trench, Huxley, and Geikie; no doubt the

vehement attacks made upon the phrase before the days of Fitzedward Hall, the New English Dictionary, and the Century terrified the authors so much that they were afraid to use it.

From what has been said in the foregoing paragraphs, we see that the locution under discussion has several things in its favor: (1) A continuous history in the language from the Anglo-Saxon *on hyra midlene*, through middle English *on her middes*, to modern *in their midst*. (2) Analogy, as shown by Fitzedward Hall. (3) Brevity and convenience, a potent factor in language development. (4) The fact that *midst* has been used as a noun for hundreds of years in the literature. (5) Polite usage in conversation and in public speaking.

Richard Grant White could not well object to this locution, as it has in its favor precedent, analogy, and reason, his three parents of usage.

If numbers alone count, we have not a strong case for the phrase under discussion. If quality is considered, however, the case is pretty strong, as Trench, Fitzedward Hall, the Century, and the Oxford dictionaries together will carry weight with students of language.

LXIII

INDIVIDUAL FOR MAN, ETC.

Of *individual* for *man*, or *person*, Quackenbos¹ said in 1896, "sometimes loosely substituted for *man*, *woman*, *person*." Genung² in 1900 said, "not to be used in the mere sense of 'person.' When used it should always convey some thought of *a single* person or thing as opposed to many." The Century calls it "colloquial." Oliphant,³ speaking of the adjectival

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 241.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 318.

³ *The New English*, I, 470; II, 178.

use of this word in Foote (1750), says, "This *individual* was to be worked hard in the next century." (And it *was* worked hard in the nineteenth century by the best authors and in polite society.) The New English Dictionary says, "Now chiefly as a colloquial vulgarism, or as a term of disparagement." It quotes passages from Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith, Scott, and Dr. Kane.

The writer has recorded the following cases in his course of reading:

Sir Thomas Browne.....	1	John Hay	1
Smollett	2	Leon Kellner	1
Boswell	2	London Standard	1
Dr. Johnson	4	Hawthorne	15
Lamb	2	Merivale	1
Coleridge	23	Emerson	4
De Quincey	3	Sir William Hamilton.....	13
Jeffrey	2	Bulwer	10
Audubon	1	Dickens	18
Scott	3	Poe	35
Irving	1	Motley	10
Beaconsfield	2	Daniel Webster.....	2
Cooper	26	Hallam	4
Holmes	1	Macaulay	1
Matthew Arnold	1	Minto	8
Thackeray	7	Alexander Bain.....	3
Carlyle	12	Price Collier	1
H. T. Tuckerman.....	1	Kittredge and Greenough.....	1
Dean Stanley	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	2

After reading this list, how can we think that the word is obsolescent? How can the Century Dictionary call it colloquial? How can the New English Dictionary call it a colloquial vulgarism?

We can of course say that the word is less popular with authors than it was fifty years ago. We may admit that at present it is rather old-fashioned. When, however, we see it used by writers on style like Minto and Bain, by scholars like Kittredge and Kellner, by cultivated men like Dean Stanley,

John Hay, Price Collier, A. C. Benson, and five Yale professors of English,¹ we should be careful how we condemn it.

The table given above will show that the word was very popular with Coleridge, Hawthorne, Cooper, Dickens, Bulwer, Motley, and other distinguished writers of the nineteenth century. Emerson, quite recently, said, "He named certain *individuals*, especially one man of letters, his friend, the best mind he knew, whom London had well served." Matthew Arnold says, "Acquirements take all their value and character from the power of the *individual* storing them." Minto, one of the best recent writers on style, uses the word quite frequently in his volumes. Bain, the eminent grammarian, says, "This relative clause simply adds in a convenient form further information concerning an *individual* already definitely pointed out."

Man and *person* are more used in present-day English.

LXIV

-ING FORMS WITH AND WITHOUT 'S

Which is better, "Have you heard of *Smith*, or *Smith's*, *killing* his uncle"? "Have you heard of my *barn*, or *barn's*, *falling* down"?

In 1776 George Campbell defended the possessive form against Bishop Lowth, the critic and grammarian. Lowth did not like the form in 's, although it was used by Blair, Boswell, Johnson, and other writers and scholars of his day. Gould Brown, about the middle of the nineteenth century, attacked the possessive form. In 1857, Professor J. W. Gibbs,² of Yale, said, "There is a strong tendency in popular language to employ the substantive participial in *-ing* even with a genitive noun or pronoun." Then he gives two sentences. "But," he

¹ Canby and others in their *English Composition in Theory and Practice*.

² *Philological Studies*, p. 101 (4).

continues, "all these examples are disapproved by Mr. Goold Brown, the grammarian, who has examined them with great thoroughness and ability. . . . It is doubtful, however, whether any authority can stem the current of this usage." Here are the grammarians finding fault with the language. At this very moment the *-ing* form with 's was vigorous in the writings of Dickens and George Eliot, makers of English at that time, besides Boswell, Johnson, Jane Austen, and others of earlier periods.

Dr. E. A. Abbott, in *How to Parse*,¹ calls *killing* a participle and says that the objective is "sometimes incorrectly used." (As to the "sometimes," see the subjoined lists; as to the correctness, the author will quote authorities and standard writers.) Dr. Abbott is more tolerant of the passive form; *e.g.*, "Have you heard of *Smith being killed*?" Baskervill and Sewell² say that both forms are equally correct; that the form without 's is the older; that both are found in the literature. They treat *killing* in both cases as the gerund. Sweet calls the objective form a "half-gerund," though a participle in form. He says that the objective case is preferred before names that do not denote animate objects; *i.e.*, "Have you heard of the *game being postponed*?" rather than "Have you heard of *Smith postponing the game*?" Krapp⁴ defends both forms, but draws some fine distinctions. He agrees in the main with Sweet's view. Carpenter⁵ says, "the noun or pronoun must be in the possessive, not the objective. The objective is, however, sometimes found now in literary English in such expressions, and it was still more common in the English of several generations ago." (As to whether the noun *must be* in the possessive case, see the long list of authors that use the objective. The adverb "sometimes"

¹ Pp. 234, 235.

² *English Grammar*, pp. 285, 286.

³ *New English Grammar*, part II, p. 121.

⁴ *Modern English*, pp. 301-304.

⁵ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 144, note.

should be changed to "frequently.") Jespersen¹ makes the same statement. He says, "The subject of the *-ing* . . . is for the most part put in the genitive case—nearly always when it is a personal pronoun, and generally when it indicates a person"; yet Jespersen himself uses the objective frequently in his books. Nesfield² says, "A noun or pronoun, provided it denotes a person or other animal, is usually in the possessive case, when it is placed before a gerund." He treats the *-ing* form as a participle used gerundively and calls it a Gerundive Participle. Kellner³ says the objective form is older, and that it has for the last decades been gaining ground in a surprising manner. He regards the *-ing* form as originally a participle, but now a verbal noun. Kittredge and Farley⁴ say, "The possessive case of a noun or pronoun may be used to limit a verbal noun in *-ing*." Then they add that we must say, "I have heard of *Allen's being elected*," not *Allen*.

The following tables will show the relative strength of genitive+*-ing* and objective+*-ing* in a wide course of reading. Pronouns are not included, as they are nearly always genitive in reputable authors.

1. OBJECTIVE (WITHOUT 'S)

Rolls of Parliament, 1435-1437.	1	Scott	4
Sir Thomas More	1	Irving	4
Defoe	9	Keats	1
Pope	1	Hazlitt	1
Lady Mary Wortley Montagu	1	Lamb	10
Dr. H. Blair	3	Coleridge	5
Boswell	14	De Quincey	6
Dr. Johnson	2	Mrs. Gaskell	5
Franklin	1	Kingsley	2
Byron	1	Jane Austen	3

¹ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 202.

² *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 74.

³ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, pp. 262-264.

⁴ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 147.

George Eliot	26	Prescott	1
Dickens	22	Lowell	1
Thackeray	10	Emerson	1
Carlyle	1	Freeman	4
Ruskin	2	Bagehot	1
Hawthorne	1	William James	1
Milman	1	Chesterton	7
Poe	7	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
Sir William Hamilton.....	2	Churton Collins.....	9
Matthew Arnold	3	H. W. Mabie.....	1
John Morley	1	Lounsbury	5
Justin McCarthy.....	7	John Fiske	2
Saintsbury	4	Dr. C. Geikie.....	3
William Minto	1	Price Collier	1
Huxley	5	T. N. Page.....	2
Froude	2	Sir Henry Taylor.....	5
Morris	2		

Total, 217 cases; 53 authorities.

2. GENITIVE (WITH 'S)

Milton	1	Washington	1
Jeremy Taylor	1	Jane Austen	28
Cotton Mather	1	North	1
Pepys	3	Hallam	1
Defoe	4	Southey	1
Addison	6	Leigh Hunt	1
Burnet	17	Poe	8
Steele	3	Cooper	1
Boswell	23	Ruskin	1
Dr. Johnson	13	Bulwer	1
Dr. H. Blair.....	9	George Eliot	22
Jonathan Edwards.....	3	Mrs. Gaskell	4
Izaak Walton.....	1	Dickens	17
Burke	3	Holmes	1
Fielding	8	Kingsley	3
Lamb	4	Carlyle	4
Hazlitt	5	Matthew Arnold	3
Coleridge	4	Hawthorne	2
Scott	1	De Quincey	2
Franklin	2	Tennyson	1

J. F. Genung	1	Fiske	1
Price Collier	1	Lounsbury	1
C. Geikie	1	J. M. Barrie.....;	1
G. W. Cable.....	1	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
T. N. Page.....	1	Alexander Bain.....	2
Mabie	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	2
H. N. Hudson	1	Huxley	1

Total, 231 cases; 54 authorities.

Some interesting deductions can be drawn from the foregoing statistics:

(1) The form without 's is older than the other, as we have already seen from high authorities. (2) The two forms are numerically about even (231 to 217) in the literature read. (3) Both forms are used by a large number of authors, especially the following: Defoe, Dr. Blair, Boswell, Dr. Johnson, Scott, Hazlitt, Jane Austen, George Eliot, Dickens, Matthew Arnold, Mrs. Gaskell, Kingsley, Poe. The following comparisons are interesting: George Eliot: with 's, 22; without 's, 26. Dickens: with 's, 17; without 's, 22. Lamb: with 's, 4; without 's, 10. De Quincey: with 's, 2; without 's, 6. These figures indicate that the form without 's took on considerable strength in the early part of the nineteenth century. (4) The objective form is much stronger than the other in some of the best recent writers; *c. g.*,

Thackeray	objective	10; possessive	0
Justin McCarthy	objective	7; possessive	0
G. K. Chesterton.....	objective	7; possessive	0
Churton Collins	objective	9; possessive	0
Lounsbury	objective	5; possessive	1

These figures would indicate that the possessive form may ultimately disappear from the literature. (5) Addison, Bishop Burnet, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Hugh Blair, and Jane Austen preferred the possessive overwhelmingly; but we have shown that after their day the tide turned in favor of the

objective. (6) Objective form, fifty-three authorities; possessive, fifty-four, for several centuries. (7) In the nineteenth century, the objective and the possessive forms are in the ratio of eight to five, respectively.

It may be added as an interesting fact that neither of these locutions appeals to the poets, as no one of the 449 examples was found in poetry, although the author has read widely in the British and American poets. Is there any reason for this? Is the "gerundive participle," as Nesfield calls it, unsuited to poetry? Yes; it is prose.

Query: What became of the locution from 1435-1437, when we first found it, to the time of Sir Thomas More? Probably it was passing its time of probation in some parts of England, waiting for its day to come. This, we know, is true of many locutions: they emerge, disappear, and emerge again in greater vigor.

Jespersen says that the objective *-ing* is two hundred years old; but the table proves that it goes back to 1435-1437, showing itself later in the writings of Sir Thomas More. It comes out pretty strongly in Daniel Defoe, who, in the tables, has nine objectives and four genitives. A hundred years later, Boswell uses the objective pretty frequently, though preferring the genitive.

Is there any reason why the objective noun should gradually supplant the possessive? Some suggestions may be ventured. First: there are a good many cases in which the possessive is rarely used; *e.g.*, with *this* and *that*, as in the sentence, "Have you ever heard of *this* (or *that*) *being done*?" Again: with plural nouns; as, "Have you heard of all the *Smiths being injured*?" The writer has never seen the possessive sign in such a sentence. Thirdly: when modifying words, phrases, or clauses intervene between the noun and the *-ing* form; *e.g.*, "Have you heard of *Smith, the carpenter, being injured*?" "Have you heard of *Smith, of Tammany Hall, being killed*?" "Have you heard of *Smith, who used*

to be pitcher, being injured?” In none of these sentences can the ’s be used.

While the objective noun has been spreading, the pronoun has kept to the possessive form much more closely. It is not usual to find such sentences as, “Have you heard of *him* (or *me*) *being elected?*” These are heard considerably in colloquial English, but occur only occasionally in the literature.

Dr. E. A. Abbott’s statement,¹ then, is too drastic: “incorrectly” is the wrong word and “sometimes” is equally so. This eminent grammarian set the writer against the objective form in days gone by and has no doubt influenced others.

It was said above that some authors use both forms pretty frequently. In fact we sometimes see them close together on the page, even in the same sentence. This is certainly true of George Eliot.

We have seen that there are several places where the ’s-form could not possibly be used. We have seen also that the objective form made great headway in the nineteenth century. Are these two facts connected? Does not language move along the lines of least resistance? If there are two ways of expressing the same idea in a given language, will not the easier one, the one offering least resistance, prevail ultimately? This is, of course, a fundamental law of language.

The grammarians will no doubt continue to argue as to the best name for this form in *-ing*. We know now that both locutions are strong in the literature and that the name is of minor importance. “Verbal” is non-committal. “Gerundive Participle” is a plausible title. The grammarian and the rhetorician can only watch the movement of the language and be ready to report changes in the future.

Let us see how both forms are used by the same writer. George Eliot (*Daniel Deronda*) says, “it ended in *Rex’s* being obliged to consent,” etc.; “Papa approved of *Gwendolen’s* accepting him,” etc.; “she began to be aware that she was out

¹ See *supra*.

of place, and to dread *Deronda's* seeing her"; "Don't you approve of a *wife* burning incense before her husband?" . . . "How could Hetty . . . think much of poor old *Thias* being drowned?" (*Adam Bede*.) Charles Lamb says, "I had reckoned in particular on my *aunt's* living many years." . . . "I should be scandalized at a *bon mot* issuing from his oracle-looking mouth."

It would seem that the objective and the genitive forms of the noun are about even unless euphony or word-order interferes; and it does not appear that *Smith's* is to any extent more general than *barn's* in the model sentences at the head of this section, though further investigation may change the writer's views on this subject.

Abbott's statement, then, cannot be accepted. (1) He calls the objective + *-ing* incorrect, though used by the best authors. (2) He says that it is rare, which the tables disprove. (3) He speaks of the genitive + *noun* as "the native verbal use," as if the other were not equally native.

LXV

JEOPARDIZE

Some rhetorical scholars and many purists will not tolerate *jeopardize*; but say that we must use *jeopard*. T. L. K. Oliphant¹ calls it "barbarous." Quackenbos² calls it "a monstrosity," and says we might as well say "walkize", "singize." Genung³ says *jeopard* is better. William Cullen Bryant put it on his forbidden list.

The Century, however, recognizes it, quoting passages from Sir Henry Taylor and Robert Browning—the latter saying "*jeopardize* my life." Webster, the Standard, and Worcester recognize it, the first-named quoting the same passage from

¹ *The New English*, I, 246.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 231, note 2.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 318.

Taylor that the Century quotes. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Sir Henry Taylor, Trench, Dean Stanley, and Sidney Lee.

The writer has seen the word twice in Poe, once in the works of Cyril Ransome, a distinguished English Shakespearian; once in the editorial columns of the New England *Journal of Education*, and once each in H. W. Mabie and Bret Harte.

Jeopardize fills the mouth better, seems to carry an emotional connotation, and also has a distinctively verbal ending. Besides high literary authority, it has wide vogue in "polite society."

Poe in his *Purloined Letter* says, "this fact gives the holder of the document an ascendancy over the illustrious personage whose honor and peace are so *jeopardized*."

LXVI

JOURNAL

Genung¹ says, "*Journal* (from French *jour*, a day) is not properly used of a monthly or quarterly magazine." Dr. E. A. Abbott, the grammarian, takes the same view. In his *Shakespearian Grammar*² he says, "now it is restricted to a daily newspaper or memoir." If *journal* is limited to a daily paper, why not limit *journey* to a day's travel? The same argument would apply to the two words.

The Standard as its fourth meaning gives "newspaper." Worcester gives the same definition. Webster says, "a periodical; a magazine." The Century says, "any publication issued at successive periods containing reports or records of current events of any kind." The Encyclopedie Dictionary says, "now extended to any newspaper or other periodical

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 318.

² P. 13.

published at certain intervals. Thus we may speak of a weekly, monthly, or yearly *journal*; a publication recording the transactions of a society, as the *Journal* of the Geological Society." The New English Dictionary gives the same wide meaning to the word.

The word *journal* has extended its meaning as words so often do. We have the *American Journal of Philology*, quarterly; the *Educational Journal*, New York, monthly; the *New England Journal of Education*, weekly, and others too numerous to mention. The editors of these *journals* may well be considered as reputable authors worth quoting as authorities in elegant English. The author can add one passage from Charles Lamb and one from Price Collier. It would seem, then, that the two scholars quoted in our first paragraph are in a decided minority.

Lamb, in a letter to a London paper, not a daily, said, "A word from you, sir—a hint in your *journal*—would be sufficient to fling open the doors of the beautiful temple again, as we can remember them when we were boys." Price Collier, in his *England and the English*, says, "certain of their *journals*, the *Spectator* and *Times* for example, are unimpeachable in their style and temper." The *Spectator* is a weekly publication.

LXVII

KINE FOR COWS

The plural *kine* (=cows) is familiar to all readers of the Bible, the word *cows* not being used by the translators of 1611: "Pharaoh's lean *kine*" is known to all.

The Century Dictionary calls *kine* archaic, and cites passages from Milton and Holmes. Baskervill and Sewell¹ quote

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 39.

Thoreau. Nesfield¹ recognizes it as a plural of *cow*. Carpenter² says, "still used in poetry."

The form is rare in modern prose. Andrew Lang uses it at least seven times in his *Iliad*, but that is "prose-poetry."

The word is used in the following:

Latimer	1	Bret Harte	2
King James Bible.....	15	P. H. Hayne.....	2
Jeremy Taylor	1	Andrew Lang.....	7
Milton	1	Swinburne	3
Herrick	1	Longfellow	2
Bryant	1	John Fiske	1
Southey	3	Stevenson	1
Matthew Arnold	2		

Stevenson in *Kidnapped* says, "I met plenty of people, grubbing in little miserable fields that would not keep a cat, or herding little *kine* about the bigness of asses."

The table above proves that *kine* is not exclusively poetic as some of the authors quoted wrote no poetry.

LXVIII

LENGTHY

Lengthy was on William Cullen Bryant's forbidden list. The Century says, "sometimes with the idea of tediousness attached." To illustrate this, the Century quoted a passage from Southey's *Doctor*; but the same dictionary quotes an author not so well known as speaking of "a *lengthy* rifle." Genuig³ says, "not to be used indiscriminately for *long*. Applied to expression, *lengthy* may be defined as 'having length without force.'"

Generally speaking, the foregoing remarks about *lengthy* are correct, but we sometimes see it used with no unpleasant

¹ *English Grammar Past and Present*, pp. 20, 319.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 55.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 319.

connotation. For instance: Professor C. W. C. Oman speaks of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as a pair of "*lengthy* epic poems," where we are sure he was not using the word in an unpleasant meaning. A. H. Clough uses it in the sense of "long": "Were your descent more *lengthy* than mine"—thus violating Genung's canon. George Eliot in *Silas Marner* speaks of "a *lengthy* business"; *i.e.*, a long-drawn-out, tedious business. Harold Littledale, a distinguished English writer, says in his volume on the *Idylls of the King*, "Lady Guest's book being still hardly accessible to the general run of students, I am under the necessity of making some *lengthy* extracts from it," etc. Here *lengthy* means "rather long," "longer than I should prefer to make."

Lengthy is not a very common word in the literature, but in its less pleasant sense often hits the nail on the head exactly: it is one of those words that show the speaker's feeling on the subject under discussion; and it is less harsh than *tedious*.

The word is recognized by the New English Dictionary, Worcester, the Standard, and Webster. The last named quotes Washington, Byron, Jefferson, and Archbishop Trench. The first named quotes Washington, Jefferson, and Alexander Hamilton. Genung uses it himself at least three times in his books, with no idea of tediousness.

The authorities are about 15 to 1 in favor of using the word: as to its connotation, it may be said that the unfavorable one is more common.

As an exact synonym of "long," *lengthy* has no *raison d'être*; but, if it should confine itself to the idea of tediousness, it would fill a useful niche in the language.

Fitzedward Hall¹ argued that the word was not an Americanism but was used in England before the days of long-winded American orations. He says also that it had been adopted in England by all but "finical purists."

¹ *Modern English*, 1873, p. 56.

LXIX

LESSER

The double comparative *lesser*, composed of *less* + *er*, is used very frequently in literature from Elizabethan times to the present.

Doctor Johnson was stoutly opposed to the word. Dean Alford¹ called it an irregularity, but said that it was "sanctioned by our best writers . . . uniformly." His explanation of *lesser* is that it came in to balance *greater* in the sentence. Of course this is altogether fanciful and unphilological.

The Oxford Dictionary recognizes *lesser*, quoting the King James Bible, Burke, Winter, Tennyson, Kinglake, and Howells. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, with quotations from the Bible and Shakespeare. Webster recognizes it, with passages from the Bible, Shakespeare, Pope, and Locke. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Daniel.

Recent grammarians—not the "lesser" ones, however—recognize the form. T. L. K. Oliphant² says that the form came in about 1470, and was used by William Tyndale about 1525. Bain,³ the eminent Scotch grammarian, speaks of it as "an admitted form," and quotes three authorities. Carpenter, Nesfield, and Baskervill and Sewell recognize it as one of the comparatives of *little*. Nesfield quotes Joseph Hall

The writer has seen the word in the following authorities:

King James Bible ⁴	1	Burnet	1
Massinger	2	Lamb	5
Shakespeare ⁵	4	De Quincey	1
Dryden	2	Holmes	3

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 85, 86.

² *The New English*, I, 314, 322; II, 198.

³ *Higher English Grammar*, p. 147.

⁴ The concordance shows other examples.

⁵ The concordance gives a number of other passages.

Cooper	2	H. W. Mallie	3
Matthew Arnold	2	Stopford Brooke.....	1
Longfellow	1	Whitney	2
Froude	1	Saintsbury	3
Bulwer	2	O. F. Emerson	1
Poe	1	Kipling	2
Hawthorne	1	Edwin Arnold	1
Hallam	3	E. C. Stedman.....	1

These citations prove that the word has been in good literary use in England and in America for nearly four centuries.

The sentence, "Of two evils, choose the *lesser*," is familiar to every reader. The Bible phrase, "the *lesser* light," is equally familiar and no doubt has influenced many writers.

The word seems to be growing in favor among men of culture on both sides of the water. In the list above are found ten or twelve of the most elegant authors of the nineteenth century.

What is the objection to *lesser*? Probably the idea that it is a double comparative and that double comparatives are not in keeping with the "genius" of modern English. The last statement is true; but what of the first? Is *lesser* really a double comparative in anything but its etymology? Is *less* a comparative to any one but a scholar? Do we say "a less star" or "a smaller star"? Could we say "the less light" or must we choose between "the *lesser* light" and "the smaller light"? *Lesser* is a fossilized double comparative. Why an English adjective cannot have two forms for the comparative we cannot imagine: any student of languages will recall adjectives with two or more forms in the comparative and superlative degrees.

Lesser has made a special place for itself in the language. For instance, the phrases "*Lesser* Asia", "*Lesser* Armenia," the *lesser* grammarians," etc., are well established, *lesser* being equivalent to *minor*. We may say that *lesser* is the required form before the noun in certain phrases without the article and in other phrases with the article.

Less is shorn of much of its work by both *lesser* and *small*. We do not say, "He is *less* than his brother" but "*smaller* than his brother." An old Bible term, "James the Less," still fossilizes the word in its original meaning as the comparative of *little*.

De Quincey says, "the *lesser* star could not rise, before the greater should submit to eclipse." Matthew Arnold says, "all I want now to point out is that they have this, and that we have it in a much *lesser* degree." Tennyson says, "Woman is the *lesser* man." Longfellow says,

Ah! with what subtle meaning did the Greek
Call thee the *lesser* mystery at the feast
Whereof the greater mystery is death!

Whitney says, "And no sooner does Galileo discover for us the *lesser* orbs which circle about Jupiter and others of our sister planets, than," etc.

Foremost has been cited in another section (see p. 74) as a double superlative.

LXX

LOAN AS A VERB

The Century Dictionary calls *loan* (=lend) "objectionable." Richard Grant White,¹ A. S. Hill,² Genung,³ and Quaekenbos⁴ all join in condemning it. Worcester says, "Modern, and chiefly American." The Encyclopedic Dictionary marks it as unusual. The Standard Dictionary marks it "U. S." The New English Dictionary says, "Now chiefly U. S." All this looks ominous for the word, though the last-named dictionary quotes Calhoun and some minor authors.

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 137, 138.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 234.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 319.

⁴ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 239.

Webster's International recognizes it, citing Chancellor Kent and an obscure author of the seventeenth century. The most ardent and most prominent defender of the word is Lounsbury,¹ the doughty champion of many words oppressed and abused by the pedants and purists. As Lounsbury's *The Standard of Usage in English* may not be accessible to all of our readers, it may be well to epitomize his treatment of *loan* as a verb: *Loan* is a Scandinavian word, which as a noun supplanted the corresponding Anglo-Saxon word. In an act of parliament of 1542-43 it is used as a verb. After occasional use in England, it was transplanted to America: "though not American in origin, it is American by adoption." Joel Barlow used it in 1778. For some reason, says Lounsbury, it has been made the subject of hostile criticism, although it has antiquity, precedent, and analogy in its favor. Those who are willing to follow one great leader can use *loan* with Professor Lounsbury's unqualified approval: the overwhelming sentiment of scholars is against it, though a noun can become a verb at any moment.

The writer has seen the word only three times—once in H. W. Mabie's and once in Professor F. E. Schelling's books, both American writers, men of superior culture; and once in Rudyard Kipling's serious verse.

The weight of numbers is certainly against *loan*; but Lounsbury's name is a tower of strength, and the other authorities are of high order, though few in number.

Popular usage in America is very strong in favor of *loan* but the writers do not use it. Indeed the use of *loan* as a verb has no *raison d'être* whatever at present: it has made no attempt to establish any special territory for itself and is a useless synonym of *lend*. The bankers might make it a technical term; among real estate dealers it has considerable vogue.

¹ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 203-205.

LXXI

MATHEMATICS—SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

The question raised in the title to this section might seem to have but one possible answer; yet it is only a short time since *mathematics* was used as a plural by eminent authors, scholars, and literati.

A. S. Hill¹ says, "more frequently singular." Genung² recognizes both numbers. Most of the dictionaries, if they say anything in regard to the matter, give the singular.

The plural, however, occurs occasionally in the writings of Bishop Berkeley and of De Quincey; at least twenty-two times in the essays of Sir William Hamilton (died 1856); occasionally in Poe, Ruskin, Christopher North, Browning, Matthew Arnold and John Stuart Mill—all comparatively recent. The fact that Hamilton used it so often is good proof that it was in vogue in academic circles in Great Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century. A prominent English scholar, writing in America in 1868, uses the plural. This fact, coupled with its use by Poe, would prove that the plural had some vogue in America in the generations just back of us.

Poe in the *Purloined Letter* says, "The mathematics *are* the science of form and quantity." De Quincey says, "Mathematics, it is well known, *are* extensively cultivated in the north of England." Sir William Hamilton says, "mathematics *are* of primary importance as a logical exercise of reason."

The singular seems to be universal in America at present.

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 59.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 320.

LXXII

ME AS A QUASI-NOMINATIVE

To the "lesser grammarians" the heading of this section will bring a shudder. The purist will close this book in scorn and derision. None the less, the writer will give a fair and impartial account of *me* in its use as a nominative case of the pronoun.

T. L. K. Oliphant¹ in his well-known volumes shows that *me* as a nominative runs through English literature for centuries. It occurs both in the predicative position, that is, after the verb, and also alone in reply to a question; *e.g.*, "Who said that?" "Me." It is especially common in the drama.

As me (=as I) occurs in Scott, Shakespeare, Steele, and Charles Kingsley. In order to account for the *me*, some grammarians have construed *as* as a preposition. This is utterly unsatisfactory, for it is easier to construe *me* as a fossilized nominative than to parse *as* as a preposition.

Than me (=than I) is as common as *as me*. It is found in Shakespeare, Swift, Prior, Pope, Southey, and A. H. Clough. Nesfield,² one of our best living grammarians, parses *than* in these locutions as a preposition with the objective. Dean Alford³ treated it in the same way fifty years ago. The writer, however, had rather take *me* as a quasi-nominative.

No one would dare to say that the English language has ever permitted the use of *me* at the head of the sentence; *e.g.*, "*Me* told you." But, in an isolated position, as "Who told you that?" answer, "Me," it has been running in the literature and in polite society for several centuries. Again: after the verb, *e.g.*, *it was me, that's me*, cited by Oliphant.⁴

¹ *The New English*, II, 107, 159.

² *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 94.

³ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 160.

⁴ *The New English*, II, pp. 107, 159.

This brings us to the much-disputed, never-to-be-settled, *it is me*. Those who have no respect for authority or recognize no authority in language, might as well skip over the rest of this section. If there is no tribunal of appeal; if every man is to have his own opinion and not be influenced by the usage of polite society and of great authors, and by the opinion of the learned, then no disputed points can ever be settled. In law, politics, religion, we accept the mandates of a higher court; then why not do so in language?

Now, the purists and pedants cannot conceive how *it is me* can ever be right; they will not listen to argument. The great scholars, however, can conceive of *me* as a quasi-nominative *after* the verb. We find the phrase *it is me* stoutly defended by Earle,¹ Lounsbury,² Latham,³ Alford,⁴ Kellner,⁵ A. J. Ellis,⁶ Jespersen,⁷ Sweet,⁸ and other scholars of international fame, not to supplant *it is I* in dignified or solemn discourse but as permissible in colloquial English. Latham recognized it as a "secondary nominative." Alford said that everybody used it in England in his day; Henry Sweet says the same thing. Professor John Earle not only corroborated the statement of these two scholars but treated *it is I* as "an intruder." Leon Kellner, the Austrian scholar, in his history of English syntax, returns several times to *it is me*, explaining its origin. Lounsbury says that it is used by Shakespeare, Marlowe, Greene, Lodge, Fletcher, and Addison. (Who will not accept the usage of Addison, the famous author of the *Spectator*?) A. J. Ellis,⁶ one of the most profound students of the language, said in 1864 that *it is me* is good English, and *it is I*, a mistaken purism.

¹ *Philology of the English Tongue*, edition of 1887, pp. 539, 540.

² *History of the English Language*, pp. 165, 273.

³ *History of the English Language*, p. 586.

⁴ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 154ff.

⁵ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, pp. 42, 135.

⁶ Note F, *The Queen's English*, edition of 1866.

⁷ *Progress in Language*, §§ 184, 194.

⁸ *Short Historical English Grammar*, p. 105.

Richard Grant White, the most austere of all our verbalists, said that *it is me* is not entirely vulgar. George P. Marsh, a pioneer in English studies in America, said that it was heard very frequently among educated people in England but not in America. Dean Alford, in writing to a number of scholars, had to decide between *it will be I* and *it will be me*, and used the latter. More recently, T. L. K. Olyphant spoke of "our common *it's me*," though he did not approve of it. The American scholar O. F. Emerson¹ says, "found in America, and may be justified in opposition to the schools." Jespersen, the distinguished Dane, defends *it is me* very strenuously. In his *Progress in Language* (1894) he says, "The eminent author of *Early English Pronunciation* (Ellis) is no doubt right in defending *it's me* as the natural form against the blames of quasi-grammarians. . . . *It is me* is certainly more natural than *it is I*." Jespersen says that "grammar schools and school grammars" have interfered with the spread of this phrase.

It is me has been treated as a barbarism in so many school-books that it would be impossible to state the case for the prosecution. A few textbooks may be mentioned on account of their long popularity. Quackenbos² says, "as unphilological as it is vulgar. . . . Those who condone *it is me* must, if consistent, tolerate *it is us*, *these are them*, the stepping-stone to *them's them*." A. S. Hill³ classes it as an error but says that it is used in England by many educated persons. Nesfield,⁴ one of the leading recent grammarians of England, advises against the use of *it is me*.

If human testimony can send a man to the gallows, it might certainly establish the fact that, in 1859, 1864, 1867, and 1910, *it is me* was used by the educated classes of England. Some educated Americans, also, can testify that it slips very

¹ *History of the English Language*, p. 324.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, edition of 1896, p. 236.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 169 and note.

⁴ *English Grammar, Past and Present*, p. 204.

naturally out of their mouths in spite of Marsh's statement that no educated American would use it.

As to the origin of *it's me*, scholars are not unanimous. Latham, one of the earlier English scholars, compared it with the French *c'est moi*. More recent scholars—Earle, Lounsbury, and others—think that the French phrase may have influenced the English. Jespersen, however, believes that *I* tends to become *me* after the verb; the pronoun gets into the place usually occupied by the object and so takes the objective form. He cites the Danish *det er mig* as analogous to the English *it is me*. We have it on good authority, also, that *it is me* is almost universal in Norwegian literature, while *it is I* is just coming in. A pretty safe theory, then, would be that the English *it is me* is a blending of the Teutonic and French post-verbal pronoun forms.

As to the time when *it's me* came into the language, we cannot be certain. Kellner says, "I do not find any instance of this now widely spread use before the eighteenth century"; but Oliphant¹ cites a case of *it was me* from Wycherley (about 1660).

The following passages² will show how this quasi-nominative *me* has been used by some of the standard authors. Wycherley says, "It was *me* you followed." Shelley, in his *Ode to the West Wind*, addresses the wind:

Be thou, Spirit fierce,
My spirit! Be thou *me*, impetuous one!

Rossetti in *Stratton Water* says:

In God's name, Janet, is it *me*
Thy ghost has come to seek?

Steele in the *Spectator* (132) says: "do not think such a man as thyself terrible for thy garb, nor such a one as *me*

¹ *The New English*, II, p. 107.

² For further examples, see C. Alphonso Smith's *Studies in English Syntax*. Smith cites eight passages from Shakespeare, one each from Goldsmith, Gray, J. M. Barrie, Browning, Whittier, Emerson, Stevenson, and Kipling.

contemptible for mine." Kingsley makes Hereward say, "We have failed, just because there were a dozen men in England as good as *me*, every man wanting his own way." Ralph Waldo Emerson says, "I am my brother and my brother is *me*." Alice Cary in a poem writes:

Once when we lingered, sorrow-proof,
My gentle love and *me*.

Stevenson in *Treasure Island* says, "But Silver, from the other boat, looked sharply over and called out to know if that were *me*." Jespersen, in his explanation of this *me*, cites numerous passages from the literature. (See note 7, p. 154, above.)

It may be added that *it is her*, *it is him*, and other like phrases have little standing with scholars and little authority in standard literature.

LXXIII

MECHANICS

Mechanics is so overwhelmingly singular in its grammar that the author saw only one plural, which was in one of Christopher North's essays.

LXXIV

MEMORANDUMS

About fifty years ago, Richard Grant White made a strong plea for the *s*-plural of *memorandum* instead of the Latin form. White used it himself in his books; he also cited the word from Shakespeare.¹ Webster recognizes the word, quoting Sir Joshua Reynolds. The Century recognizes it as

¹ Used by the Prince in *1 Henry IV*, III, iii.

the less frequent plural, and quotes Beaumont. Carpenter¹ recommends the form *memorandums*, though he, of course, recognizes the Latin plural in *-a*. He expresses the hope that the familiar words like *memorandum*, *bandit*, and *formula* will soon be pluralized by adding *s*, instead of keeping their foreign plurals—"a consummation devoutly to be wished," we add heartily. Meiklejohn treats *memorandums*² as "fully naturalized" and gives only the *s*-plural. Bain,³ another Scotch grammarian, takes the same position. This would indicate that Carpenter's wish is being fulfilled on the other side of the water. Kittredge and Farley⁴ recognize it.

The writer has seen the form *memorandums* in the *Letters of the Time of James I*; several times in Defoe's *History of the Plague*; twice in Boswell; once in Goldsmith.

While a large number of educated people take special pains to say *memoranda*, they might, in view of the facts in the case, save themselves the trouble. The merchants are using the *s*-form in thousands of notebooks given to their customers; this is popularizing the form. A helping hand from the teacher's desk, the pulpit, and the editorial sanctum could soon sweep the word into universal popularity. In the same way, "criterions", "beaus", "radiuses", "phenomenons," and other English plurals would soon spread through the language. Genung gave "criterions" a start in one of his college textbooks. Only a small number of the foreign words in English would long resist this movement. Our pupils need relief; foreign plurals are a weariness to the spirit. If a freshman uses "dictums" instead of "dicta," shall we criticize him severely? He should rather be commended for following his language instinct.

Defoe (*Plague*) says, "my *memorandums* of these things," etc. Boswell in his *Johnson* says, "among his resolutions or

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 56.

² *The English Language*, p. 18.

³ *Higher English Grammar*, p. 128.

⁴ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 37.

memorandums . . . there is'' etc. Again, in a letter to Johnson he says, "I like your little *memorandums*," etc. His writing thus to the great Cham would lead us to infer that the Doctor himself did not object to the English plural.

LXXV

METAPHYSICS—SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

Metaphysics is not plural as often as *mathematics*. Sir William Hamilton, who used the latter frequently as a plural, treated the former regularly as a singular. Coleridge, however, used *metaphysics* as a plural at least three times in his essays, and the writer has seen it once in Macaulay. In his essay on Robert Montgomery, Macaulay says, "Mr. Robert Montgomery's metaphysics *are* not at present our game." This was in 1830, and is the most recent case recorded by the author of this volume.

Coleridge about fifteen years earlier said, "Aye, here now! (exclaimed the critic) here *come* Coleridge's metaphysics." . . . "Poor unlucky Metaphysicks! and what *are* they?"

No doubt Macaulay had heard the plural in academic circles while he was at college.

LXXVI

MIGHTY AS AN ADVERB

Phrases like "I am *mighty* glad to see you," as used in some parts of America, often strike strangers as peculiar; but, like many other colloquial words in the New World, *mighty* as an adverb was brought over by the early settlers at a time when it was reputable London English.

Webster says, "Colloquial," but quotes Jeffrey and Doddridge. The Century says, "Colloquial," but quotes Prior and Sheridan. The Encyclopedic Dictionary says, "Collo-

qual," but quotes Prior. Baskervill and Sewell¹ say, "The adverb *mightly* is very common in colloquial English. . . . It is only occasionally used in literary English." They quote Goldsmith, Scott, Bulwer, and Thackeray. The New English Dictionary says, "Now colloquial or familiar." It quotes Coverdale, Barrow, Defoe, Gray, Dickens, Mrs. Carlyle, and Stevenson.

All of the authorities cited above agree that this locution used to be literary but is now colloquial. After watching the word carefully in the literature, the writer can name the following authorities that use it:

Coverdale	1	Burke	1
Defoe	4	Thomas Jefferson	1
Pepys	4	Lamb	4
Steele	1	Tennyson	1
Dr. Johnson	13	Holmes	4
Boswell	1	Thackeray	6
Prior	8	Browning	1
Pope	2	Stevenson	18
Miss Burney	1	Philadelphia Press (editorial) . .	1

When did this word drop out of the literary language? It is found in the literature from the *Cursor Mundi* to living authors and editors. It is vigorous in the polite circles of the older states and in parts of the West.

The writer is especially interested in this word, as his use of it sometimes excites comment in some of the newer states of this country.

Jefferson, for Virginia, and Holmes, for Massachusetts, represent polite English of the older commonwealths. In recent English, Robert Louis Stevenson should be regarded as an authority. (See the table.)

It may be said that the word is not quite as good as "very" for the solemn and dignified places; *e.g.*, epic poetry, pulpit style, and such places. If we were translating Homer, we

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 187.

should hardly say, "Hector's wounds were *mighty* deep." Again: if we were delivering a sermon, we should prefer to say "very"; as, "The words of our text are *very*, (not *mighty*), rich with meaning." Even literary English has its gradations: words in good standing are not on a dead level.

The New English Dictionary comes nearer hitting the mark than the others quoted. The others said "colloquial" and stopped there, but the New English Dictionary said "colloquial or familiar." If this means literature of a familiar or free-and-easy type, it is right, since the passages referred to in our table are generally on that order. Tennyson's case occurs in a conversation of the confidential, free-and-easy style. The other recent authors write very frequently in the same manner.

The point that the writer, in conclusion, contends for is that *mighty* used as an adverb is not a provincialism: (1) because it is not confined to any one part of the country; (2) because it is used by such eminent writers as Tennyson, Holmes, Thackeray, Browning, and Stevenson.

Edmund Burke (*Conciliation*) says, "All this is *mighty* well." Boswell represents Johnson as using the word frequently. Holmes (*Professor at the Breakfast Table*) says, "*Mighty* close quarters they were where the young man John bestowed himself and his furniture." Tennyson (*Holy Grail*, l. 699) says,

And *mighty* reverent at our grace was he.

Browning (*The Ring and the Book*) says,

Mighty fine—

But nobody cared ask to paint the same.

Stevenson (*François Villon*) says, "The idiotic Tabary became *mighty* confidential as to his past life"; "*Mighty* polite they showed themselves, and made him many fine speeches in return." Stevenson uses the word ten times in *Kidnapped*.

The word may be called literary but not suitable for solemn diction, though used by a good many living authors of considerable repute.

LXXVII

THE MISPLACED RELATIVE CLAUSE

In Sestos he admitted a deputation from Poland into his presence, *whom he astonished*, etc. (*Milman*.)

At the time when this great battle was fought, two children had already been born in England *who were destined*, etc. (*John Fiske*.)

The relative clause is not always placed near its antecedent but is often separated from it by a group of words varying in number. Most of the textbooks on rhetoric are loud in condemning these sentences. Possibly they are right; but is not their rule a theoretical one? Certainly it is not based upon the overwhelming usage of the best authors; for a large number of these use sentences like the two quoted from Fiske and Milman. The rhetorical scholars give us a pretty theory, which perhaps has some pedagogic value as tending to give coherence to the disorganized sentences of our youths. If, however, a bright student, trained by us to watch the usage of the great authors, brings us a group of sentences which he has found in the works of great men and which are exactly like some we have been condemning in the lecture-room, it is rather embarrassing.

If Milman and Fiske, two of our most fluent and entertaining stylists, do not suit the reader, he can refer to the subjoined table, in which the author has recorded a large number of the highest authorities as violating this rule:

Latimer	5	Shakespeare	1
Prayer Book Psalter.....	25	Sir Thomas Browne.....	4
King James Bible.....	28	Marlowe	2
Bacon	3	Milton	3

Jeremy Taylor	38	George William Curtis.....	5
Thomas Fuller	1	George Eliot	13
Bunyan	5	Dickens	16
Baxter	4	Trench	7
Joseph Hall	1	Audubon	1
Bishop Burnet	17	Thackeray	70
John Evelyn.....	1	Bayard Taylor	2
Pope	4	Matthew Arnold	13
Mary Wortley Montagu.....	2	Froude	28
Temple	1	Daniel Webster	1
Swift	3	Wendell Phillips	1
Addison	28	Sir William Hamilton.....	2
Steele	4	Benjamin Disraeli	1
Fielding	4	J. H. Newman.....	2
Dr. H. Blair.....	19	Saintsbury	10
Dr. Johnson	29	Thomas Campbell	1
Boswell	5	Churton Collins	1
Goldsmith	16	Phillips Brooks	6
Lamb	11	Lowell	12
Coleridge	10	Dean Stanley	9
Christopher North	3	Morris	4
Southey	3	Sir Henry Taylor.....	16
William Hazlitt.....	10	William Minto	4
Horace Walpole	1	Walter Bagehot	2
Sir William Blackstone.....	1	Justin McCarthy	3
Gibbon	1	Dr. C. Geikie.....	1
Thomas Warton	1	Cooper	3
Thomas Paine	1	Holmes	16
Walter Scott.....	18	G. W. Cable.....	3
Burke	11	Stopford Brooke	12
Irving	8	G. K. Chesterton.....	8
Franklin	6	T. N. Page.....	3
Jeffrey	2	Mrs. H. Ward.....	9
Hallam	13	Stevenson	5
De Quincey	14	A. J. W. Hare.....	1
I. D'Israeli	1	E. L. Godkin.....	1
Ruskin	12	J. R. Green.....	2
Hawthorne	8	Kittredge and Greenough.....	1
Carlyle	6	John Lubbock	4
Emerson	21	Lounsbury	13
Poe	29	Genung	10
D. G. Mitchell	1	Milman	3

Kingsley	2	Henry Drummond	1
Herbert Spencer	1	W. D. Howells.....	1
Fiske	6	Price Collier	6
Prescott	1	Mabie	21
Motley	8	James Bryce	3
Macaulay	24		

The lists show more than 100 authors and 800 passages. Among the worst violators of the rule are the Bible, the Prayer Book, Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Burnet, Addison, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Blair, Scott, Thackeray, Poe, Macaulay, and Froude—a hall of fame. Hardly less careless of their relatives are Coleridge, Hazlitt, Burke, Lamb, De Quincey, Ruskin, Emerson, Lowell, Stanley, Mrs. Ward, Lounsbury, Holmes, Dickens, and Matthew Arnold.

Professor Genung violates his own canon; who has the heart to blame him? The tables will show that he does not try to keep his own rigid rules. When he loses himself in his subject and forgets the letter of the law in keeping its spirit, he forgets, ignores the strict rules that he lays down in his textbooks, and uses the English of the great authors.

The rule under discussion is made in the interests of clearness. Now, the type-sentences at the head of this section may fail somewhat in absolute precision but certainly not in perspicuity. Any intelligent, or even average, reader can easily see their meaning. Is not the rule misleading? Does it not, as generally stated, make the impression that it is based upon the overwhelming usage of the great authors? The rule needs careful restatement and qualification. It may be added, however, that the great authors more frequently put the relative immediately after its antecedent.

Let us quote a few passages showing the misplaced relative in some of the standard authors. Cardinal Newman (*Historical Sketches*) says, “strangers were ever flocking to it, whose combat was to be with intellectual, not physical dif-

ficulties," etc. Emerson says (*Love*), "It is a fact often observed, that men have written good verses under the inspiration of passion, *who cannot write well under any other circumstances.*" Again (*The Poet*): "Vitruvius announces the old opinion of artists, that no architect can build any house well, *who does not know something of anatomy.*" De Quincey in *Lake Poets* says, "A young lady became a neighbor, and a daily companion of Coleridge's walks, *whom I will not describe more particularly than by saying that intellectually she was very much superior to Mrs. Coleridge.*" Again: "A rupture between the parties followed, *which no reconciliation has ever healed.*" Matthew Arnold (*Function of Criticism*), says, "and that therefore labor may be vainly spent in attempting it, *which might with more fruit be used in preparing for it, in rendering it possible*"; also, "Poems are separated one from another *which possess a kinship of subject,*" etc. (*Essay on Wordsworth.*)

A volume could easily be filled with such sentences from standard authors.

LXXVIII

MISRELATED PARTICIPLE (OR GERUND)

My farm consisted of about twenty acres of excellent land, *having given* an hundred pounds for my predecessor's good-will. (*Goldsmith.*)

Having passed away the greatest part of the morning in hearing the knight's reflections, which were partly private and partly political, he asked me if I would smoke a pipe with him. (*Addison.*)

The sentences quoted above are typical: they run through the whole of our literature, as the most casual reader can testify.

The "error" involved in these sentences is called the "mis-related", "dislocated", or "dangling" participle; while a

closely related error involves the verbal noun or gerund; *e.g.*, "Mathematics is deliberately suppressed in *trying* to induce an equal fondness for Latin."

This construction is condemned in practically all the best textbooks on grammar and rhetoric. A. S. Hill,¹ in his high school Rhetoric, says, "Sometimes a sentence lacks unity of form because it contains a participle, an adjective, or some other word that hangs loose in it." Under this head he puts all verbal forms in *-ing* that do not hang close to some other word. He illustrates by sentences like those at the head of this section, and uses the sentence quoted in the foregoing paragraph. Herrick and Damon² call these words "loose," "dangling," or "hanging," participles. Sentences in which they are found are called "inadmissible." Genung³ gives the rule, "Express clearly the subject of a participle." He calls the failure to do this a "frequent error of hasty writers," but admits that the construction is allowable sometimes when there is no danger of ambiguity. Canby and his coadjutors,⁴ in their textbook, say, "Participles must be watched; they cannot be trusted without strict surveillance." According to the most prominent teachers of rhetoric, then, the so-called "misrelated participle" has little standing. If these writers are to be our authorities, then, a large number, or most, of our best authors, scholars, stylists, professors of rhetoric themselves, use sentences that are inadmissible and must be called hasty writers. The rhetorical scholars do not make it quite clear why this use of the participle, etc., is so inexcusable; they simply denounce it in general terms as violating the unity of form. Some of the grammarians are equally severe. Henry Sweet,⁵ one of the greatest writers on syntax, says, "This harsh construction is quite a mannerism with

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 423-425.

² *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 149.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 58. *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 115.

⁴ *English Composition in Theory and Practice*, p. 130.

⁵ *New English Grammar*, part II, p. 125.

some writers." Carpenter says participles should, as a rule, limit a "specific noun or pronoun." Baskervill and Sewell call such constructions "a misuse of the participial phrase," but illustrate by quoting sentences from Franklin, Goldsmith, Burke, and Scott. Dr. E. A. Abbott¹ calls it the "Participle with Implied Noun," and says, "It is scarcely correct though not very uncommon." These grammarians are not much clearer than the writers on rhetoric in pointing out the special objection to this construction. Sweet calls it harsh, but does not show why it is harsh. Dr. Abbott, who is less severe than some others, has a faint impression that the construction is found in a number of the standard authors.

Professor George P. Krapp² is much more liberal than the authorities thus far quoted. Though advising unskilled writers to follow the rules as laid down in the textbooks we have quoted, he says that the "dangling participle" is often justified, both in speech and in literary language, by "the logic of the general situation." He shows this by sentences from Carlyle and Stevenson. Professor Krapp insists, however, that clearness must be maintained; still he does not demand that every participle shall have a subject fully expressed, but simply one that can be easily inferred by the reader. Nor does he call the participle "dangerous" and say it "must be watched," as if the participle were an atrocious criminal to be dragged to jail by a bevy of policemen.

Possibly some reader of this volume, knowing how liberal and tolerant Professor Krapp is in regard to many disputed points in English, may not be willing to accept his view of this matter. Let us see, then, what a disinterested foreigner says about it; how it strikes a great German grammarian who is of course free from all prejudices *pro* and *con* that we who are born to the English language almost inherit from our parents, certainly catch from half-taught instructors and from

¹ *How to Parse*, p. 238.

² *Modern English*, p. 306.

books written by sciolists and purists. We refer to Mätzner,¹ the eminent grammarian. Of this participle he says: "Although the participle in general, where it stands absolutely, is not without a substantive or pronoun on which it has to lean, participles standing alone also occur, which lean in part mediately upon a noun, or leave to be supplied a notion already named; but, in part, completely isolated, must leave a subject to be conjectured." This scholar, then, recognizes the participle standing alone. He finds it all through the literature. He does not call it "inadmissible", "careless", "hasty," but treats it as a regular phenomenon of the language. He then shows the various phases under which this participle makes its appearance: (1) the logical subject of the participle may have to be gathered from a possessive pronoun; (2) or from some noun or pronoun gone before; (3) subjects to the participle not expressly denoted may, often in the dialogue, be the speakers or one of them. Here is a distinct recognition, by a great German scholar, of a participle which many of our own scholars have called by all kinds of names implying that it is a monstrosity in our literature, while they quote sentences from the most eminent authors to show how hasty these writers are and how many of them perpetrate inadmissible sentences. Mätzner quotes some of the same and others to show what good authority he has for his treatment of the locution. Among the authorities he cites are Mandeville, the Coventry Mysteries, Shakespeare, Sheridan Knowles, Butler, Scott, Cooper, Irving, and Sir Frederick Madden, a distinguished list of murderers of the King's English.

But possibly some one will say that Krapp and Mätzner are specialists in language; therefore not to be trusted implicitly. Let us turn, then, to a man who is not a specialist in the same sense as these, but a cultivated scholar who has shown a profound knowledge of some periods of English literature, and who is thoroughly qualified to know good English when

¹ *English Grammar*, (Greene's translation) III, pp. 72, 73.

he sees it. Professor F. E. Schelling in his edition of the *Merchant of Venice*¹ comments upon one of these misrelated participles so common in Shakespeare:

How could he see to do them? *having made one*.
Methinks it should have power to steal both his
And leave itself unfurnish'd. (III. ii. 124-126.)

Professor Schelling says, "We expect a verb agreeing with this clause to follow; but in the hurry of Bassanio's rapturous speech the construction is not carried out. Such examples of colloquial phraseology in Shakespeare, far from being blemishes, add greatly to the dramatic quality of his dialogue." Test Bassanio's sentence by Professor Krapp's canon. Is clearness maintained? Does the merest schoolboy have the least difficulty in understanding that the word "he" in line 124 is the subject of this "dangling", "dislocated" participle? Professor Schelling calls this phrase "colloquial phraseology," but the table below shows that this construction is found in standard prose from Latimer to the best essayists, rhetorical scholars, and poets of the present.

The following list of passages in which this participle is used is by no means exhaustive:

Latimer	1	Johnson	2
Shakespeare	13	Boswell	2
Bacon	1	Coleridge	2
Thomas Fuller	1	Burke	2
Wycherley	1	Gibbon	1
Defoe	4	Hazlitt	1
Pope	2	Lamb	6
Addison	1	Southey	1
Steele	2	Freneau	1
Cotton Mather	1	Franklin	1
Swift	1	Irving	2
Berkeley	1	Scott	7
Dr. H. Blair	3	Christopher North	1
Fielding	2	Jane Austen	6
Goldsmith	5	Mrs. Gaskell	1

¹ P. 170.

Hallam	2	Bulwer	7
Poe	18	Cooper	4
Merivale	1	Holmes	2
Hawthorne	16	Tennyson	2
Webster	1	George William Curtis.....	3
Parkman	1	Herbert Spencer	2
Wendell Phillips	1	Alexander Bain	1
Thackeray	13	William Minto.....	1
Dickens	5	Saintsbury	1
De Quincey	3	Browning	1
Carlyle	2	Sir John Lubbock.....	1
Calhoun	1	Mabie	5
Ruskin	3	J. F. Genung.....	1
George Eliot	1	Cable	1
Prescott	1	Stephen Phillips	1
Bayard Taylor	1	C. Geikie	1
Charles Darwin	1	Professor O. F. Emerson.....	3
Francis Palgrave	1	John Fiske	1
Froude	4	Stevenson	2

Here are 68 authorities in 189 passages. This is a mere indication of what might be gathered from the literature.

The "misrelated participle" goes back to the Anglo-Saxon period. It is found both in prose and in poetry. It comes out clearly in Mandeville and in Chaucer, being especially noticed by Professor O. F. Emerson in his *Selections from Chaucer*:¹ "This is the misrelated participle occasionally found in modern English." (As to the word "occasionally," see the list of 68 authors in the foregoing paragraphs.) It is seen in the Mystery Plays, Latimer, Shakespeare, and in every decade down to the present day. It is used in polite society and by cultivated speakers without number. Certainly it may be called the "misapprehended," the "persecuted," participle.

The writer is not arguing for the use of this construction. As a matter of mere theory, he thinks the rhetorics and the grammars are right in their criticism. It is no doubt better that a participle or any other verbal form should have

¹ P. II, Introduction.

its noun or pronoun within immediate reach; but our language has never made the east-iron rule that it must be so. The only test is clearness; is the thought perspicuous? If so, the demands of language, certainly of English, have been fully met, and the hard-and-fast rules quoted above are not warranted either by the necessities of language or by the usage of polite speakers and the mass of great authors.

The writers on style not infrequently contend for strict precision to the extent of pedantry; the great authors are satisfied if they express themselves with general perspicuity.

To show how this participle is used in the literature, the following additional quotations are offered: Thomas Fuller (*The Holy State*) says, "Drake continued his course for Porto Rico; and, *riding* within the road, a shot from the Castle entered the steerage of the ship," etc. Dean Swift (*Gulliver's Travels*) says, "The pupils, at his command, took each of them hold of an iron handle, whereof there were forty fixt round the edges of the frame, and *giving* them a sudden turn, the whole disposition of the words was entirely changed." Ruskin (*Sesame and Lilies*) says, "*keeping* the figure a little longer, even at cost of tiresomeness, for it is a thoroughly useful one, the metal you are in search of being the author's mind or meaning, his words are as the rock which you have to crush and smelt in order to get at it." Hawthorne in *The Custom House* says, "*Bred* up from boyhood in the Custom House, it was his proper field of activity": "In *accomplishing* the main purpose, it has appeared allowable, by a few extra touches," etc. Burke in his speech on *Conciliation* says, "*comparing* it with the ordinary circumstances of human nature, it was a happy and a liberal condition." Gibbon (*Memoirs of My Life*, etc.) says, "Dr. ——— well remembered that he had a salary to receive, and only forgot that he had a duty to perform. Instead of *guiding* the studies, and *watching* over the behavior of his disciple, I was never summoned to attend even the ceremony of a lecture."

LXXIX

MUTUAL FRIEND

No locution in the language has caused more discussion than *mutual friend*. Dean Alford¹ opposed it violently. He called it "sheer nonsense"; said that it should be "common friend." Macaulay had already called it "a vulgarism." Quaekenbos² calls it "grossly erroneous." A. S. Hill³ says, "it has never been in good use, and it is not likely to be." Genung⁴ and Hart condemn it in their textbooks.

Some high authorities avoid it while admitting that it has some standing in the language. For instance, Nesfield⁵ says, "anomalous, but sanctioned by usage." The *Encyclopedic Dictionary* says that it is incorrect but sanctioned by high authority. Webster, while admitting that *mutual* for "common" has had high authority, thinks that "a tendency toward careful discrimination has set in." The *Century Dictionary* says that *mutual friend* is not infrequently used by writers of high repute, but does not endorse it. The *Century* quotes Blacklock (1786), Dickens, and Walter Scott as using it. The *New English Dictionary* says, "Commonly censured as incorrect, but still often used. . . . *Mutual* is the only adjective correctly expressing the intended meaning." This dictionary quotes passages from the writings of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Burke, Scott, George Eliot, and L. Oliphant. Fitzedward Hall⁶ cites passages from Burke, Sterne, Colman, Dickens, and a few obscure authors. Lounsbury⁷ in 1908 came to the rescue of this much abused phrase, and says that

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 223, 224.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 240.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 278.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 321.

⁵ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 205.

⁶ *Modern English*, p. 241.

⁷ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 111, 144.

it was used by Burke, Jane Austen, Scott, Disraeli, Byron, and Browning. The writer has seen it in the following:

Dickens	3	Bulwer	1
Thackeray	3	T. N. Page.....	1

In the lists above we have fourteen authors of high repute, besides Blacklock, a minor writer. This is not a very strong array of statistics; it helps to show that a good many authors are influenced by attacks made upon a locution by some and by lukewarm commendation from others.

Some of the best authors have adopted "common friend" either wholly or partially. Among these are Burke, Johnson, Boswell, Macaulay, John Morley, and Mrs. Humphry Ward. But "common friend" will hardly become popular. We do not object to saying "the common defense", "our common interests", "a common treasury"; but, in the phrase "common friend," the adjective has an unpleasant suggestion, has a slight possibility of being misapprehended.

For over three centuries *mutual* has been coming into the territory of "common." In 1555 Cavendish uses "mutual brother" in his *Life of Wolsey*, and Oliphant regards this as the earliest progenitor of *mutual friend*. Shakespeare has "mutual act of all our souls", "mutual load", "mutual cry", "mutual stand." Bentley has "mutual weeping"; Congreve, "mutual ruin" for "common ruin"; Pope, "mutual hate" (of a third person), "mutual wants"; Swift, "mutual elogs"; Jefferson, "mutual guide"; Washington, "mutual cares, labors, and dangers"; Bulwer, "mutual sojourn", "mutual enthusiasm", "mutual safety"; Mrs. Gaskell, "mutual want"; Newman, "mutual defence"; Bayard Taylor, "mutual fate" and "mutual burden"; Hawthorne, "mutual crime"; Rossetti, "mutual dreams"; Dickens, "mutual consent" (of a large party); Thackeray, "mutual acquaintance" and "mutual friend"; Hallam, "mutual defence"; Tennyson, "mutual mother." A famous and familiar old hymn, also, has

helped no little in this matter. In that hymn, "Blest be the tie that binds," we sing of "mutual woes" and "mutual burdens." This hymn was composed in 1772. Fourteen years later, Blacklock wrote about a *mutual friend*. So both the author of the hymn and Blacklock had precedent for these phrases in those quoted above from Shakespeare, Cavendish, Pope, and others in a foregoing paragraph.

Dickens, then, when he used *mutual friend*, had the authority of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Burke, Sterne, Colman, Scott, Byron, and Jane Austen, besides other less eminent authors. We may infer, also, that *mutual friend* had a wide vogue in polite colloquial English in England, as it has certainly had in many parts of America. Is it credible that Dickens and his publishers would have put *Our Mutual Friend* on the press if the name had been objectionable to the educated classes? What author would dare to name a book—*Our Common Friend*?

Why all this opposition to "mutual friend"? What is the cause of the antagonism? Nothing but the "devil of derivation" spoken of by Professor Lounsbury as seizing such men as Walter Savage Landor and Richard Grant White of earlier generations and some excellent men of our own day. Because Latin *mutuus* means reciprocal, the idea of reciprocity must always be present in the English word "mutual"; a third person must be a "common friend," *i. e.*, common to the other two; he cannot be mutual or reciprocal. Of course this is logically true; but language does not stop to take counsel of logic.

A few passages from the literature will show how the reputable authors use the phrase in question. Bulwer in *Pelham* says, "I said, in a low tone, that I was the bearer of a letter of some importance, from our *mutual friend* Lord Dawton." In *American Notes*, Dickens says, "One gentleman on board had a letter of introduction to me from a *mutual friend* in London." Thackeray, in the *Roundabout*

Papers, says, "There is my friend, Baggs, who goes about abusing me, and of course our dear *mutual friends* tell me"; "a dead gentleman who he said had been our *mutual friend*, and on the strength of this *mutual acquaintance* begged me to cash his check for five pounds."

LXXX

MYSELF FOR I OR ME, ETC.

But out of this catastrophe to most of our skirmishes, and to all our pitched battles except one, grew a standing schism between my brother and *myself*. (*De Quincey*.)

The use of *myself* for *me* and *I*; *himself* for *he* and *him*, and other locutions of like kind, is condemned in some textbooks and by many teachers. Genung¹ says, "*Myself*, not to be used for unemphatic *I*." Quackenbos² says it is ungrammatical and snobbish in the extreme. A. S. Hill,³ while not so severe as Quackenbos, expresses a preference for the simple personal pronoun, and we shall not quarrel with him. Kittredge and Farley⁴ condemn these forms in their Grammar.

The sentence from De Quincey at the head of this section represents a widely prevalent usage in polite society not altogether "snobbish." As to whether the authors that use these forms are all snobs, the reader can judge from the following:

Malory	1	Marlowe	1
King James Bible.....	1	John Webster	2
Shakespeare	12	Milton	2

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 321.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 240.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 114.

⁴ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 62.

Jeremy Taylor	2	De Quincey	18
Bishop Burnet	1	Jane Austen	2
Addison	1	Hawthorne	3
Matthew Prior	1	Holmes	8
Dr. Johnson	2	Mrs. Gaskell	1
Boswell	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	15
Burke	1	Poe	80
Jefferson	11	Bulwer	21
Franklin	9	D. G. Mitchell.....	1
Coleridge	3	Bryant	1
Lamb	3	Browning	1
Christopher North	1	Thackeray	6
Cowper	1	Tennyson	13
Byron	1	W. W. Skeat	1
Wordsworth	1	Stevenson	6
Hallam	1		

As far as the writer noticed, Poe is the worst offender; he is the most "snobbish" of our writers.

This use of the *self*-forms has been in English for at least six hundred years. Mätzner cites cases from the best literature of the thirteenth century. The writer has cited 37 of the best authors from Malory to William Cullen Bryant and Ik Marvel in America, and Stevenson in England. On the list stand Addison, Dr. Johnson, and William Cullen Bryant, three of the autocrats of good English. Many of the authors cited use the "easy language of cultivated men who are neither specialists nor pedants."

This locution was brought from England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by cultivated colonists and handed down to the present day in polite society.

Addison in the *Spectator* says, "When we had placed him in his coach, with *myself* at his left hand, the captain before him," etc. Burke (*Conciliation*) says, "No man was indeed ever better disposed, or worse qualified, for such an undertaking, than *myself*." De Quincey says, "I examined him steadfastly for a minute or more; and it struck me that he saw neither *myself* nor any other object in the street." (*Lake*

Poets.) Again, *ibidem*: “an opinion deliberately expressed to *myself* by the late Sir Humphrey Davy”; “Miss Wordsworth and *myself* being in the rear.”

LXXXI

NONE—SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

Is *none* singular or plural? The writer has been asked this question and will try to answer it.

The English grammarian Nesfield¹ says, “was originally used only as a Singular. . . . the plural sense is now equally or more common.” Baskervill and Sewell² say, “in the prose of the present day usually plural.” On this side they quote Carlyle, Professor Dana, Emerson, Scott, Thackeray, and Thoreau. On the side of the singular, they quote the Bible, Lowell, and Scott. “The singular,” they add, “is often found in the Bible.” A more correct statement would be, “In the literature of the present day more frequently plural. . . . The singular is far more common in the Bible.” Lounsbury,³ in his most recent book on language, defends both singular and plural, and says that *none* is probably used most in the plural. He quotes plural cases from the Bible, Bacon, Shakespeare, Milton, and Browning. The New English Dictionary says, “The plural is now the commoner usage.” Carpenter⁴ in his grammar says, “*none*, originally singular, is now treated as either singular or plural.” A. S. Hill,⁵ in his school Rhetoric, says, “*None* may be either singular or plural.” Herrick and Damon, in their Rhetoric, say, “Either singular or plural.” Kittredge⁶ says, “either singular or plural.”

¹ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 39.

² *English Grammar*, p. 301.

³ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 159-162.

⁴ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 181.

⁵ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 136.

⁶ Kittredge and Farley's *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 64.

Lounsbury says that the construction *none* with a plural verb has been held up to censure because it does not conform to "the crazy canon of derivation" already referred to in these pages under the figure of demoniac possession, some having discovered that *none* is singular by derivation.

The grammarians and the rhetorical scholars agree remarkably in regard to this question. We have seen that they say, "Both singular and plural." The point to be settled by our study is the ratio between the singular and the plural. The writer has studied this word carefully in the literature from Thomas Malory to the best living writers, and found it in about 100 authors and about 300 places.

Taking the literature as a whole, both prose and poetry, for about 450 years, the ratio is approximately sixteen to thirteen in favor of the plural. Taking the literature as a whole down to *Paradise Lost*, the ratio is about three to one in favor of the singular. From Milton to the present, the ratio is about seven to four in favor of the plural, a very decided change in favor of the plural.

None (from A.S., *ne*+*ān*) started out as a singular. In the King James Bible it is still overwhelmingly singular. In Shakespeare, Bacon, and other Elizabethan authors the plural is coming into use along with the singular. With Dr. Samuel Johnson in the next century the ratio is nine to one in favor of the plural; and the two cases used by Boswell¹ are plural. From the time of Johnson the two uses have run parallel in the literature, with the preponderance on the side of the plural—seven to four, as said already. A great many authorities use both singular and plural; *e. g.*, King James Bible, Shakespeare, Bacon, John Webster, Milton, Addison, Swift, Dryden, Burke, Kingsley, Browning, Tennyson, William Minto, and many others. A few authors show a tendency to use the plural exclusively; *e. g.*, Bulwer, Professor G. P. Krapp, and Professor A. W. Pollard—the last two being

¹ In his *Life of Johnson*.

specialists in English philology and literature. On the other hand, a few are especially partial to the singular; *c. g.*, Browning and Macaulay. Taking the literature from Malory to the present, sixty-nine authorities use the singular; eighty-two, the plural. Taking the literature from *Paradise Lost* to the present, fifty-six use the singular; seventy-five, the plural. (Many are counted on both sides.) From every point of view, then, the plural is considerably stronger than the singular in the literature. In polite speech it seems to be almost universal with the verb; *c. g.*, “None of us *are* (or *were*) able to say”; but with two pronouns together the singular is used consistently; *e. g.*, “*None* of us *knows* when *his* hour is coming.”

The writer has seen *none* with the plural verb or pronoun 165 times in the plural; 133 times in the singular.

Let us glance back at the opening paragraph. Nesfield is correct in his first statement, but needs some amendment in his second. Baskervill and Sewell should say, not “usually plural,” but “plural in the majority of cases.” Lounsbury should drop “probably” out of his statement. Carpenter and A. S. Hill are safe in their statements, but rather vague: there is safety in vagueness.

None is sounds rather puristic. It is likely that the plural will eventually be almost universal in spoken English and increase its ratio in literature, the tendency in modern English being against purism and in favor of a wide latitude and liberty, practical rather than puristic.

Tennyson (*Sir Galahad*) says,

I hear a voice, but none *are* there.

In *Guinevere*, he says,

None *knows* it, and my tears have brought me good.

Is there none

Will tell the King I love him tho' so late?

Emerson (*Emancipation Address*) says, "By a certain fatality, none but the vilest arguments *were* brought forward, which corrupted the very persons who used them." Motley (*Dutch Republic*) says, "There *were* none to hear him, except the fugitive whom he had been hunting"; and "There *were* none who could hope to escape the gripe of the new tax-gatherers." Poe in *Israfel* says, "None *sing* so wildly well," etc. Fronde (*Lives of the Saints*) says, "Doubtless the 'Lives of the Saints' are full of lies. *Are* there none in the Iliad? in the legends of Aeneas?" De Quincey in *The Female Infidel* says, "it might be difficult for the officers to say, as none of us *were* making any tumult."

The singular occurs in many of the best authors. Landor says,

I strove with none, for none *was* worth my strife.

Arnold (*Memorial Verses*) says,

Sing him thy best! for few or none
Hears thy voice right, now he is gone.

Maeaulay (*History of England*) says, "The Royalists themselves confessed that, in every department of honest industry, the discarded warriors prospered beyond other men, that none *was* charged with any theft or robbery, that none *was* heard to ask an alms," etc.

In most passages where *none* clearly means "no one," the singular verb is used by the standard authors.

LXXXII

NOT ONLY—BUT (ALSO)

The same word, indeed, was *not only* treated in this respect differently by different authors, *but* differently at different places in the same manuscript. (*Lounsbury.*)

The sentence quoted from Professor Lounsbury violates a rule of the school rhetorics. We cannot deny that, theoretically, the sentence might be somewhat better in form if *not only* and *but* both came immediately before the same part of speech. To do this in the case above would require a complete recasting of the sentence. Is the game worth the candle? Can any intelligent person have the least difficulty in understanding the meaning of the author?

Take this quotation from Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*: "*Not only* in the verses of those who have professed their admiration of his genius, *but* even of those who have distinguished themselves by hostility to his theory," etc. Is there any trouble in understanding the author's meaning? Coleridge commits this "error" pretty frequently.

The literature is filled with sentences like the two quoted from Coleridge and Lounsbury. The writer has collected a few out of the multitude that stared at him from famous pages:

Bacon	2	Burnet	2
King James Bible.....	1	Hazlitt	5
Sidney	1	Coleridge	8
Izaak Walton	2	De Quincey	2
Ben Jonson	1	Lamb	1
Sir Thomas Browne.....	3	Thomas Warton	2
Jeremy Taylor	6	Dr. H. Blair	3
Dr. Johnson	2	Burke	3
Goldsmith	2	Franklin	1
Boswell	5	Scott	1
Addison	5	Sir William Hamilton	1

Poe	6	Minto	1
Prescott	2	Milman	1
Motley	1	Stevenson	1
Macaulay	6	Churton Collins	1
J. F. D. Maurice.....	1	E. C. Stedman	1
B. Disraeli	2	Sir John Lubbock	1
Dickens	1	George William Curtis	1
Hallam	3	H. W. Mabie	10
Cooper	2	Lounsbury	6
Carlyle	1	James Bryce	1
Thackeray	2	Chesterton	3
Bagehot	1	C. Geikie	1
Matthew Arnold	7	Sir Henry Taylor	1
Lowell	1	John Earle	1
Holmes	1	John Fiske	2
Stanley	1	Huxley	6

Here are 54 authorities, about 125 "faulty" sentences. How can a teacher of rhetoric condemn sentences involving this locution when he finds them all through the literature? The rules in the rhetorics set forth a pretty theory. It may be all right to train the young minds to shoot up like straight, erect plants; but after all we may make them puristic and pedantic. What will they say when they see these "faulty" sentences on every page of our best literature? They may rise up and damn us as purists and pedants.

A few more sentences from standard authors will show how these writers violate the rule that *not only—but (also)* must always stand before the same part of speech. De Quincey (*Lake Poets*) says, "It is *not only* the very smallest chapel by all degrees in England, *but* is so mere a toy in outward appearance, that," etc.; "he *not only* received letters addressed to him under this assumed name . . . *but* he himself continually franked letters by that name"; "Now, this being a capital offence, being *not only* a forgery *but* sure to be prosecuted, nobody presumed to question his pretences any longer." Dean Stanley (*Memorials of Canterbury*) says, "it is *not only* a sign of the violent convulsion through which the Reformation

was effected, *but* it is a sign also," etc. Lord Macaulay says, "At fifteen he was *not only* fit for the university, *but* carried thither a classical taste and a stock of learning which would have done honor to a Master of Arts"; "The Lord Lieutenant was *not only* licentious and corrupt, *but* was distinguished from other libertines and jobbers by a callous impudence," etc. (*Essay on Addison*.) In the *Spectator*, number 452, Addison says, "These several dishes of news are so very agreeable to the palate of my countrymen, that they are *not only* pleased with them when they are served up hot, *but* when they they are again set cold before them," etc. Burke (*Conciliation*) says, "I walk down upon the open plain, and undertake to show that they (*i.e.*, the Americans) were *not only* quiet, *but* showed many unequivocal marks of acknowledgment and gratitude."

LXXXIII

NOW AS A CONJUNCTION

Only a few of our best grammars recognize *now* as a conjunction. Abbott¹ recognizes it, saying that it started out as "now that," the "that" falling out. Baskervill and Sewell² recognize it, quoting a sentence from H. H. Jackson. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, citing an example from *Piers Plowman* and one from Shakespeare. Webster recognizes it, giving an example from Shakespeare. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, citing passages from Marlowe, Nash, Shakespeare, and Defoe.

As the authorities cited by these dictionaries are rather old, let us quote from authors of a much more modern period. Mrs. Gaskell in *Cranford* says, "Lady Glenmire, *now* we had

¹ *How to Parse*, p. 254.

² *English Grammar*, pp. 195, 196.

time to look at her, proved to be a bright little woman of middle age. . . ." Matthew Arnold writes,

I knew it when my life was young;
I feel it still *now* youth is o'er.

The author has recorded the following cases:

Interlude of Thersytes.....	1	Cowper	1
Massinger	1	Horace Walpole	1
Bacon	1	Franklin	1
Shakespeare	5	Shelley	1
Ben Jonson	4	Mrs. Gaskell.....	1
Joseph Hall	1	Lamb	7
Milton	2	George Eliot	14
Baxter	1	Matthew Arnold	2
Temple	1	Keble	1
Congreve	1	Tennyson	2

Now (A.S. *nū*) is one of the oldest conjunctions in the language. It occurs several times in *Beowulf*, and frequently elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon literature. It occurs in *Piers Plowman*, as cited by the Century Dictionary and verified by the author. It comes out clearly in the Elizabethan literature and maintains itself to the most modern period. In brief, it has never been obsolete in English literature, as our table shows.

The "that" was not found in Anglo-Saxon; "*now* (*nū*) I have come from afar," says *Beowulf*—where *now* = *since*.

As shown in another section, "directly", "immediately," and even "instantly" are used to some extent as conjunctions in England, and "once" is tending in the same direction. (See pp. 71ff., above.)

As some readers may not have access to the dictionaries referred to in a foregoing paragraph, let us quote from a few authors of earlier modern literature. Milton in *Lycidas* says,

But, oh! the heavy change, *now* thou art gone.

Lord Bacon says, "When the World was young, it begate more Children; But *now* it is old, it begets fewer." Lamb

(*The Last Essays of Elia*) says, "holidays, and all other fun, are gone *now* we are rich." Joseph Hall says, "And *now* the evening is come, no tradesman doth more carefully take in his wares, clear his shopboard, and shut his window, than I would shut up my thoughts, and clear my mind." George Eliot (*Adam Bede*) says, "It was right that things should look strange and disordered and wretched, *now* the old man had come to his end in that sad way."

The table shows that George Eliot brought this conjunction down to our own day in full force.

LXXXIV

OF A MORNING, ETC.

The time-phrases *of a morning*, *of an evening*, etc., found in the "old Virginia dialect," occur in recent literature to a noticeable extent. Professor Earle¹ says, "Instead of *evenings* and *mornings*" used, as he says, in homely and familiar speech, "we may say *of an evening*, *of a morning*." To show that these locutions are allowable in literary English, Earle quotes from A. J. W. Hare. *Of a Saturday night*, he quotes from Walter Scott. *Of the afternoon* occurs in *Hamlet*.²

Of an evening, etc., can be seen in the following authors:

Pepys	1	George Eliot	3
Lamb	3	Browning	4
Irving	1	D. G. Mitchell.....	2
Bulwer	1	Holmes	2
Thomas Hughes	1	Thomas Nelson Page	1
Thackeray	11	Price Collier.....	1
E. C. Stedman	1	Aldrich	2

These phrases can be heard to a considerable extent among the best people of the old states, though they are somewhat antiquated.

¹ *Philology of the English Tongue*, 1887, p. 427.

² "My custom always of the afternoon."

Thackeray, who is especially partial to these phrases, uses also *of later days, of a Sunday, of late nights*. George Eliot uses *of late years, of a Sunday, of a morning*. Pepys says, *of a Sunday night*. They all belong together.

Dr. E. A. Abbott in his *How to Parse*¹ says, "Only in vernacular English is *of* now used for *during* . . . but this was once more common." That he was mistaken in his first statement can be seen clearly from the statement of Professor John Earle as to recent usage in England and from the number of very modern authors in the table.

The author is not arguing for the revival of these old phrases, but showing that they still survive in standard literature. *Of late years, of a sudden, of old—*

God of our fathers, known *of old—*

and a few others are still seen in the best authors and heard from the best speakers very often; the others are less common.

In "popular talk," as Kellner would say, we hear all these old phrases frequently. Certainly they should not be called illiterate when found in the works of so many excellent authors and among many old families in polite society.

E. C. Stedman (*Nature and Elements of Poetry*) says, "She sees the moon where it should be *of an evening* in its third quarter,—to wit, rising in the east." Donald G. Mitchell (*Reveries*) says, "if I cannot open the window readily *of a morning*, to breathe the fresh air, I knock out a pane or two of glass with my boot"; "I happened only a little while ago to drop into the college chapel *of a Sunday*." Browning (*The Ring and the Book*) says,

As to stand gazing by the hour on high,
Of May-eves, while she sat and let him smile.

Again:

She brought a neighbor's child of my own age
To play with me *of rainy afternoons*.

¹ P. 219.

In *Mr. Sludge, the Medium*, he says,

Because one brindled heifer, late in March,
Stiffened her tail *of evenings*.

When the stag had to break with his foot, *of a morning*,
A drinking-hole out of the fresh, tender ice
That covered the pond. (*The Flight of the Duchess*.)

The foregoing citations corroborate Earle's statement made about 1870 and show that the old-fashioned Americans of that day were using some of the same old phrases current in the polite circles of England.

These phrases in *of* are the modern English equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon genitive of time. This survives in the dialectical "evenings" and "mornings." A parallel case is the German adverb *morgens*=in the morning.

LXXXV

ONLY

The position of *only* has long been a burning question in English. Not to go farther back than fifty years, Dean Alford¹ said in 1864 that the pedants were very strict but the language very liberal. "The adverb *only*," says he, "in many sentences where strictly speaking it ought to follow its verb and to limit the objects of the verb, is in good English placed before the verb." "I *only* saw a man," he says, is our ordinary colloquial English; but the pedant would compel us to say 'I saw only a man.' The question is the same in our day: rhetorical scholars and grammarians make their rule; the great authors, the great majority of them, are utterly oblivious of the rule and care nothing for it.

A recent Rhetoric by five Yale instructors² says, "Of single

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 141-144.

² Canby and four others. This book is referred to several times in the present volume.

words it is perhaps *only* that is oftenest misplaced. It should, when possible, be placed immediately before the word with which it is connected." This same rule has been in Genung's textbooks for twenty-five years. The first statement is correct if the authors of schoolbooks are to dictate the law to the authors.

A. S. Hill¹ says, "The word *only* is especially troublesome." This is certainly true if absolute puristic precision is demanded; the standard authors *are* troublesome to the textbook-makers. Or, as Lounsbury would say, the Supreme Court is continually interfering with the justices of the peace. Hill, in one place, is diametrically opposed to Genung and the Yale Rhetoric; in another place, he makes the high school student correct a block of sentences that might have come from the works of almost any standard author.

Carpenter² says, "*Only* usually immediately precedes or follows the word or group of words which it limits." Here is confusion worse confounded. Nesfield,³ the English grammarian, after saying that the position of *only* determines the meaning of a sentence, makes up a sentence, and by moving *only* around tries to show how many things the sentence means. This is mere pedantry if literature is to be our guide in such matters: we all know that our language is not always absolutely precise, general clearness or perspicuity being often the only aim of the great masters.

Baskervill and Sewell⁴ are less rigid than several of the other writers quoted. They show that *only* is used with considerable latitude by such authorities as Palgrave, Thackeray, Wendell Phillips, N. P. Willis, Swift, Ruskin, and Emerson.

Bain⁵ is pretty rigid. He not only corrects sentences that might be duplicated in numberless standard authors but pro-

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 291.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 193.

³ *English Grammar Past and Present*, pp. 174, 175.

⁴ *English Grammar*, p. 325.

⁵ *Composition Grammar*, pp. 316-319.

poses in some cases to rewrite the sentence and leave out *only*. "He that fights custom with grammar is a fool," says Montaigne.

All this corroborates Lounsbury's statement that for many years the English language has been in the hands of the "schoolmasters," who are almost threatening to rob it of all its spontaneity.

The best and most helpful statement as to *only* is found in *Mother Tongue (III)* by Gardiner, Kittredge, and Arnold: "Good usage does not fix absolutely the position of *only* with respect to the word that it modifies. There is but one safe rule: 'Shun ambiguity.' If this is observed, the pupil may feel secure." Now we have daylight: "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." If we accept this rule very few authors of standing "misplace" *only*. If, on the other hand, we adopt the strict rules laid down by several of the books quoted, most of the standard authors "misplace" *only* frequently. As a partial list of such offenders the writer has recorded the following pretty high authorities:

Marlowe	1	Dr. H. Blair.....	4
Sir Thomas Browne.....	5	Chesterfield	11
Massinger	1	James Madison	1
Jeremy Taylor	9	Franklin	4
Bishop Burnet	8	Philip Freneau	1
Dryden	8	Burke	1
Alexander Pope	1	Gibbon	2
Addison	4	Washington	1
Steele	2	Jefferson	1
Clarendon	1	Coleridge	6
Swift	1	Lamb	3
Dr. Johnson	19	Hazlitt	13
Boswell	2	Scott	17
Fielding	1	Irving	6
Hume	2	Hallam	29
Thomas Warton	2	Jane Austen	4
George Campbell	1	De Quincey	2
Berkeley	1	Poe	24
Goldsmith	6	Paley	1

Newman	1	Stanley	6
Matthew Arnold	3	Tennyson	1
Maeaulay	5	Whitney	12
Huxley	10	Browning	4
George William Curtis	9	Phillips Brooks	2
J. A. Froude.....	20	E. L. Godkin	1
Ruskin	9	D. G. Mitchell	5
Herbert Spencer.....	1	Bagehot	5
Holmes	4	W. D. Howells.....	1
Emerson	4	Mrs. H. Ward.....	10
Bret Harte	2	Stevenson	7
Thackeray	17	Justin McCarthy.....	3
Bulwer	2	Lounsbury	4
George Eliot	11	Price Collier	2
Cooper	3	John Morley	2
Prescott	2	Saintsbury	8
Sir William Hamilton	6	Churton Collins	7
Dickens	9	H. W. Mabie.....	1
Trench	7	Chesterton	14
Bryant	2	C. Geikie	1
Darwin	1	Professor John Earle.....	8
Buckle	1	George P. Marsh.....	1
Milman	4	Freeman	1
Hawthorne	9	Henry Drummond	11
Thoreau	1	Kingsley	1
Motley	1	Stopford Brooke.....	3
Greeley	1	Sir Henry Taylor	8
Lowell	8	John Fiske	1

We have named 104 authors "misplacing" *only* in over 400 passages; and further reading would increase the number indefinitely.

Going back to Dean Alford, p. 87. He was right when he said that "I *only* saw a man," not "I saw *only* a man" was the normal sentence in polite society: the authors cited above use exactly that type of sentence more or less frequently. The worst offenders are Dr. Johnson, Hazlitt, Scott, Poe, Thackeray, George Eliot, Hallam, Dickens, Mrs. H. Ward, Froude, G. K. Chesterton, Henry Drummond. Some others are almost as wicked.

There are several forms of the *only*-sentence in English literature. A few writers like Gibbon, Macaulay, and De Quincey are generally careful to put *only* before its principal, though, as our list shows, they sometimes put it elsewhere. Then there is the type spoken of by Dean Alford: "I *only* saw a man," instead of "I saw *only* a man." This is very common in Scott, Bishop Burnet, Froude, Chesterton, Hawthorne, Hazlitt, Thackeray, Addison, Irving, Lowell, Churton Collins, Dean Stanley, Burke, George Eliot, Sir William Hamilton, Browning, Dickens, W. D. Whitney, Stevenson, Jane Austen, Dr. Johnson, Mrs. H. Ward, and others. These use the so-called misplaced *only* very frequently. Next, there is the sentence in which it would be impossible, without the most palpable pedantry, to put *only* immediately before its principal; e.g., "I can *only* say that I meant no offense whatever." Here *only* strictly modifies the clause introduced by *that*; but no good writers ever put it before the clause; and yet there is no ambiguity. A puristic critic might say, as some of the verbalists do say about constructions of like character, that *only* modifies *say*, and that the sentence means, "I can only *say*, not *feel*"; but this would be verbal hair-splitting of the most absurd kind. Another type of the *only*-sentence is one in which *only* cannot be regarded as modifying any one word, phrase, or clause but rather a whole group of words to be taken as a unit; e.g., "All that could actually take place, and all that is *only* possible to be conceived," etc. Here *only* seems to modify "possible to be conceived." Hazlitt is very partial to this use of *only*. Again: "In other poets there is much talk that *only* fills up time upon the stage." In this sentence from Samuel Johnson, *only* modifies the group "fills up time upon the stage." In a sense this *only* immediately precedes its principal; but its principal is, grammatically speaking, neither word, phrase, nor clause.

We quote a few typical passages from the literature.

Dr. Johnson in *Rasselas* says, "in a short time, I grew

weary of looking on barren uniformity, where I could *only* see again what I had already seen"; in the *Rambler*: "But pleasure is *only* received when we believe that we give it in return"; Dictionary: "Every other author may aspire to praise; the lexicographer can *only* hope to escape reproach," etc. Addison (*Spectator*) says, "The mind that lies fallow but a single day, sprouts up in follies that are *only* to be killed by a constant and assiduous culture"; "I must confess that I am amazed that the press should be *only* made use of in this way by news-writers, and the zealots of parties"; "I must observe to the reader, that above three parts of those whom I reckon among the litigious, are such as are *only* quarrelsome in their hearts, and have no opportunity of showing their passions at the bar." Hawthorne rarely if ever keeps the rule laid down in the textbooks. In the *Marble Faun* he says, "It is a peculiarity of this picture, that its profoundest expression eludes a straightforward glance, and can *only* be caught by side glimpses, or when the eye falls casually upon it"; "We see cherubs by Raphael, whose baby-innocence could *only* have been nursed in Paradise"; "all the care that Cecilia Metella's husband could bestow, to secure endless peace for her beloved relies, had *only* sufficed to make that handful of precious ashes the nucleus of battles, long ages after her death." Ruskin (*Sesame and Lilies*) says, "an unreachable schoolboy's recklessness, *only* differing from the true schoolboy's in its incapacity of being helped, because it acknowledges no master"; "The perfect loveliness of a woman's countenance can *only* consist in that majestic peace which is founded in memory of happy and useful years"; "You have heard it said . . . that flowers *only* flourish rightly in the garden of some one who loves them." Newman (*Theory of Belief*) says, "Such a reason can *only* satisfy those who regard all speculation as consisting in a helpless and endless oscillation between antagonist creeds." Matthew Arnold (*Essays in Criticism*) says, "all the books and reading in the

world are *only* valuable as they are helps to this"; "by translation I can *only* reproduce it so far as his contents give it."

LXXXVI

ONTO

Is there such a word as *onto*? The writer never gave it serious thought until he saw it recognized in Whitney's Grammar. The Standard Dictionary recognizes it but says, "Not accepted as correct usage by many authorities." Worcester records it but says, "hardly in good literary use." Webster says, "usually called a colloquialism; but it may be regarded in analogy with *into*." The Century says, "The word is regarded by purists as vulgar, and is avoided by careful writers." The Century then goes on to quote H. Rider Haggard, the *American Journal of Psychology*, Charlotte Brontë, and Mrs. Humphry Ward. The New English Dictionary says, "Analogical form but avoided by most writers, or used only when absolutely necessary for clearness." The Encyclopedic Dictionary says, "*Chiefly American.*"

The writer has seen *onto* once in Dickens, once in Conan Doyle, and more or less frequently in a few popular novelists of the day. It is rarely heard from elegant speakers or in polite colloquial English.

However, if *up+on* can give *upon*, *in+to* give *into*, etc., what hinders *on+to* from making *onto*? Nothing except that usage has not yet favored it.

The Century Dictionary quotes from Mrs. Humphry Ward (*Robert Elsmere*), "He subsided *onto* the music bench obediently." Dickens in *David Copperfield* says, "Over the little mantel-shelf was a picture of the *Sarah Jane* lugger, built at Sunderland, with a real little wooden stern stuck *onto* it." It should be said that the writer is in some doubt as to whether

Dickens wrote *onto* or *on to*; the editions differ. The same statement might be made as to some other passages cited: the printer might control the situation. However, there are sentences in which *onto* is not exactly equivalent to *on to*.

LXXXVII

PARTIALLY FOR PARTLY

Partially (=partly) was put on his forbidden list by William Cullen Bryant. A. S. Hill¹ says that careful writers avoid it. White² condemned, though citing Swinburne as using it. Genung³ says, "had better not be used," but gives no reason for his warning.

The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting passages from Stirling and Herbert Spencer. Webster recognizes it, with a quotation from Sir Thomas Browne. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Ruskin. Worcester and the Standard recognize it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Gabriel Harvey, Sir Thomas Browne, Swinburne, Lyell, and the *Educational Review*. Fitzedward Hall⁴ defends it, both on the ground of euphony and good usage. He quotes the following authors as using it: Southey, Lamb, Paley, Newman, Landor, De Quincey, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Swinburne.

The author has seen the word in the following:

Sir Thomas Browne.....	1	George P. Marsh.....	3
Lamb	2	Milman	2
Wordsworth	1	Froude	1
Poe	21	A. J. C. Hare.....	1
Hallam	1	Hawthorne	3
Trench	2	Ruskin	1

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 269.

² *Words and Their Uses*, p. 143.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 323.

⁴ *Modern English*, pp. 191, 192, 276.

Sir Henry Taylor	1	Lowell	3
Huxley	1	Henry Bradley.....	1
W. D. Whitney.....	4	H. W. Mabie.....	1
Macaulay	1	Stevenson	1
John Fiske	1	W. W. Skeat.....	4
Henry Drummond	4	George Saintsbury	2
Edward Dowden	2	Professor O. F. Emerson.....	1

Here are nearly 40 authors in all. We have both scholarship and standard usage supporting *partially*; only a few authorities condemning it. Polite colloquial usage favors it considerably. Hill's statement, made in 1902, the tables above prove utterly unwarranted.

Among all our authors Poe is probably most partial to this word: can one great author establish a word?

Partially and *partly* have been running parallel in the language for hundreds of years, used on the same page. *Partly* is used more frequently. It would seem that *partially* is rare in the Elizabethan period; it spread considerably in the nineteenth century. It was brought to America by the educated colonists and is used in the old colonial chronicles of Virginia.

The adjective *partial* (=in part) is well established, and seems to have no enemies. No doubt its wide use has helped the adverb: it is a short step from "a partial eclipse of the sun" to "the sun was *partially* eclipsed."

Milman (*History of the Jews*) says, "they are not of one speech, they have either entirely or *partially* ceased to be mutually intelligible." J. A. Froude (*Dissolution of the Monasteries*) says, "And yet, unreasonable though these demands may be, it happens, after all, that we are able *partially* to gratify them." Wordsworth in the *Prelude* says,

When into air had *partially* dissolved
That vision.

Stevenson in his *Truth of Intercourse* says, "But what is thus made plain to our apprehensions in the case of a foreign

language is *partially* true even with the tongue we learned in childhood." A. J. C. Hare uses *partially* and *partly* in the same sentence: "It was *partially* the fact that I had no money to spend in my own way, and that my bills were always overlooked and commented upon, and *partly* that I had known no other young men," etc. The list of authors above includes several very eminent English scholars and a number of great stylists. To the former class we may add Lounsbury, who uses the word pretty frequently.

LXXXVIII

PLENTY AS PREDICATE ADJECTIVE

As compared with America, servants are *plenty* and good. (*Price Collier.*)

The use of *plenty* as an adjective was condemned by George Campbell¹ in 1776. He calls it a gross vulgarism, though found in writers of considerable merit. This "gross vulgarism" was at that time classic in Shakespeare and was being used by such writers as Goldsmith and Franklin; had recently been used by Bishop Berkeley, and had been in the literature for three centuries. A. S. Hill² says, "no longer good English." Herrick and Damon,³ Quackenbos,⁴ Genung,⁵ the Standard and the Encyclopedic dictionaries all say, "Colloquial." Webster says, "Obsolete or colloquial." The New English Dictionary says, "Now chiefly colloquial," but quotes from J. R. Lowell among recent authors. As showing that the word used to be literary, the N. E. D. quotes the *Cursor Mundi*, *Ipomadon*, Lord Berners, Shakespeare, Defoe, Sydney

¹ *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Book II, chap. III, section III.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 255.

³ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 260.

⁴ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 242.

⁵ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 324.

Smith, and some minor writers. Fitzedward Hall¹ in 1873 puts *plenty* in his *Grandfathers' English*, not defending it as current. Some of the dictionaries that call it "colloquial now" quote Shakespeare, Goldsmith, and Franklin. Worcester recognizes it as an adjective. T. L. K. Oliphant² records it as seen in the literature of c. A.D. 1400. The writer has seen the following cases:

Shakespeare	1	Poe	3
Bishop Berkeley	1	Price Collier	1
Goldsmith	1	John Fiske.....	1
Byron	1	Stevenson	1

Though rare in recent literature, it has an unbroken history for over five centuries.

The word *plenty* as a predicate adjective is made classic in the literature by two passages, one humorous and the other pathetic. The first is from Shakespeare (*I Hen. IV*, II, iv, 264ff.): "If reasons were as *plenty* as blackberries, I would give no man a reason upon compulsion." The other is from Byron:

And the myrtle and ivy of sweet two-and-twenty
Are worth all your laurels, though ever so *plenty*.

This use of the word survives to some extent in the polite colloquial English of some of the old states, and was no doubt brought from England by the contemporaries of Shakespeare, Goldsmith, and Bishop Berkeley. George Campbell, then, was utterly unwarranted in calling it a vulgarism, and very illogical when he added, "Though found in writers of considerable merit." How can the two statements be reconciled?

John Fiske in *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors* says, "In the plantations, thus freed from the presence of Indians, European domestic animals have become *plenty*." If the English of Byron, Franklin, and Sydney Smith has already

¹ *Modern English*, p. 248.

² *The New English*, I, 188.

degenerated, we can certainly say that Fiske's and Price Collier's may be regarded as literary.

This use of *plenty* is rare and seems to be passing out of the language: the author is simply giving its history.

LXXXIX

THE PLEONASTIC PRONOUN

And Maud *she* walks in the merry greenwood. (*T. B. Aldrich.*)

The pleonastic pronoun dates back to the Anglo-Saxon. In that period of English, the pronoun was used either before or after the noun. Both uses lasted through the Middle English period and survive to some extent in modern English, mostly in poetry.

The type seen in the sentence quoted from T. B. Aldrich was common in Elizabethan literature and survives in illiterate English; *e. g.*, "Father, *he* is sick, but Mother, *she* is better." If any poet of our day wishes to use it, he has tradition in his support, together with the usage of the following authorities:

Chaucer	1	Wordsworth	3
William Dunbar	1	Matthew Arnold.....	1
Latimer	14	Longfellow	1
King James Bible.....	11	T. B. Aldrich.....	2
Shakespeare	11	A. H. Clough.....	3
Beaumont and Fletcher.....	1	Bryant	1
Bunyan	1	Poe	17
Prior	1	Browning	5
Pope	1	D. G. Rossetti.....	1
Southey	5	Carlyle	1
Lamb	2	Sidney Lanier	1
Shelley	1	Barry Cornwall.....	1
F. S. Key.....	1		

All recent examples, except for two authors, are found in poetry. This is one of the numerous points at which illiterate

and poetic usage come together. The only cases found in nineteenth century prose are from Poe and Carlyle, who are partial to archaic forms.

Of this pronoun Henry Sweet¹ says, "A vulgarism in spoken English, but used often in literary English for picturesqueness and quaintness." This explains the two examples from prose literature spoken of. This mode of expression has a distinct psychological value, as the unlettered classes unconsciously feel. It occurs not infrequently in current poetry and is supported by high authority.

A few more examples will show how the pleonastic pronoun is used in literature. Longfellow in *My Lost Youth* says,

And the verse of that sweet old song,
It flutters and murmurs still.

Lamb (*Old Familiar Faces*) says,

How some *they* have died, and some *they* have left me,
And some are taken from me; all are departed.

Carlyle (*The Hero as Poet*) says, "The eye, too, *it* looks out as in a kind of surprise, a kind of inquiry, why the world was of such a sort."

The writer is not advocating this use of the pronoun in prose, but merely recording usage.

XC

POLITICS—SINGULAR OR PLURAL?

The *politics* are base. (*Emerson.*)

Politics in *its* historic aspect would seem to have had a great fascination for him as indeed *it* must have, etc. (*Chesterton.*)

The sentences quoted above are typical. If such sentences are about equal in number, we shall have to say that usage is evenly divided.

¹ *New English Grammar*, part II, p. 72.

Let us turn first to those grammars and rhetories that take up the question. Carpenter,¹ the grammarian, says that *politics* is regularly plural. If "regularly" means "usually," Carpenter is right. Baskervill and Sewell² say, "usually singular." If the table below represents the usage of the authors, these last-named grammarians are in serious error. When two such grammars differ so widely, any table of statistics should be heartily welcomed.

Let us turn to the rhetorical scholars. A. S. Hill³ recognizes both singular and plural, giving one example of each from Anthony Trollope. Gemung⁴ says it is usually singular. See the list below for the truth or error of this statement.

Baskervill and Sewell give one example of the singular from the Century Dictionary; one of the plural from George William Curtis, one from Macaulay, one from Goldsmith. Their statistics contradict their theory. The New English Dictionary quotes three plurals from Hume, Junius, and Disraeli, and quotes some minor authors that use the singular congruence.

Let us turn to the great authors, the *litterateurs*, and men of culture not so famous in literature:

Singular

Thomas Paine.....	1	Century Dictionary.....	1
Trollope	1	Encyclopedic Dictionary.....	1
Emerson	1	Chesterton	1
Encyclopedia Britannica	1	Price Collier.....	2
George Eliot	1		

9 authorities; 10 cases.

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 59.

² *English Grammar*, p. 41.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 59.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 324.

Plural

Addison	2	Huxley	2
Swift	1	Thomas Campbell	1
Dr. Johnson	1	Emerson	2
Thomas Paine	1	George Eliot	2
Sheridan	1	George William Curtis.....	3
Goldsmith	1	Saintsbury	2
Charles Lamb	1	James Bryce	3
Hallam	3	Lowell	4
Matthew Arnold	1	Froude	1
Macaulay	5	Fiske	1
Dickens	1	Sir Henry Taylor.....	2
Poe	1	Price Collier	2
Thackeray	2	Justin McCarthy....	2
Trollope	1	T. N. Page	1
Bulwer	1	R. H. Stoddard.....	1

30 authorities; 52 examples.

According to the table, the word *politics* is plural by a ratio of 30 to 9 authorities, 52 to 10 passages. These facts refute the opinions of some of the grammarians and rhetorical scholars quoted in the foregoing paragraphs of this section.

The following writers are found on both sides: Emerson, Thomas Paine, George Eliot, Trollope, Price Collier. Polite colloquial usage is probably in favor of the plural.

The reader will pardon a personal allusion. The author of this volume had always heard *politics* used in the plural, and so used it himself until he saw it used as a singular by the Century Dictionary. The singular, however, never sat comfortably upon either his tongue or his penpoint. Do not the statistics gathered in this course of reading justify him in going back to the plural?

The tendeney in words in *-ics* is to take the singular regimen; such has been the case with *mathematics*, *ethics*, *physics*, *optics*; but *athletics* and *politics* seem to prefer the plural. It is of course possible that they may reverse their action in

the future, as the tendency in our day is in the direction of strict grammatical precision in such matters. An impartial study of *politics* from Queen Anne's day to the present shows that it is prevailingly plural, plural in more than three-fourths of the passages in which it is found. Further reading, however, might possibly change the figures to some extent.

Emerson (*Politics*) says, "But politics *rests* on necessary foundations, and cannot be treated with levity." Price Collier (*England and the English*) says, "In America, politics *ranks* as one of the domestic virtues; in England, politics *has been*, and *is* largely even now, the obligatory occupation of the few who can afford *it*." In the same volume he says, "British politics, both at home and abroad, *are* focused upon the maintenance in freedom and comfort of thousands of British householders," and "Here again the fact that politics, domestic and Imperial, *are* concentrated in London during a few months in the year explains to the American how this can be so." Huxley (*Science and Culture*) says, "Party politics *are* forbidden to enter into the minds of either, so far as the work of the College is concerned." Matthew Arnold in his essay on Heine says, "he read French politics by no means as we in England, most of us, read *them*." Macaulay (*Retiring Speech, 1849*) says, "I have quitted politics. I quitted *them* without one feeling of resentment, without one feeling of regret."

XCI

POSSESSIVE CASE OF INANIMATE OBJECTS

After *life's* fitful fever he sleeps well. (*Shakespeare.*)

They had come to take possession of the *city's* wealth. (*Motley.*)

Shall the possessive *s* be used of things without life? Or shall the *of*-genitive be required, certainly in prose? These are disputed points in English.

Henry Sweet¹ says that the possessive *s* is restricted, etc., mainly to nouns denoting living beings. Herriek and Damon² say, "The possessive form in *s* should not be used of inanimate objects." They allow a few exceptions such as "the ship's side", "for mercy's sake", "the day's work." A. S. Hill³ says, "The tendency of the best modern usage is to employ the objective case with *of*, rather than to put into the possessive case a noun that represents a thing without life." Genung⁴ in his high school book says, "In ordinary prose the accepted usage of the possessive form is limited, for the most part, (1) to persons; (2) to time expressions, as 'after an hour's delay'; and (3) some idioms, as 'for brevity's sake', 'a day's march.' Beyond this usage the possessive form is to be employed with great parsimony and caution." Under his division (1), Genung should say "living beings" instead of "persons," as there can be no objection to putting the *s* after a word denoting a bird, an animal, a fish, etc. Even the cautious Jespersen⁵ is inaccurate at this point. He says, "its use is now in ordinary prose almost restricted to personal beings." This does not include birds and animals, which should be included; and the table below will show that great prose writers like Scott and Hawthorne use the possessive *s* of inanimate objects, and that Professor Genung himself uses it frequently in his textbooks on rhetoric. Whether the possessive form is used "with great parsimony and caution" in our prose literature, as Genung thinks it should be, the reader can judge from the list of authors below, which is far from exhaustive.

George P. Marsh⁶ limits the possessive case to "animated and conscious creatures"—a statement which, while better than

¹ *New English Grammar*, pp. 51, 52.

² *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 146.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 50.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 55.

⁵ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 181.

⁶ *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 338.

that of some authors, is not accurate. Kittredge and Farley in their recent textbook¹ say, "In older English and in poetry the possessive case of nouns is freely used, but in modern prose it is rare unless the possessor is a living being. A phrase with *of* is used instead." Coming from Professor Kittredge, these statements will carry great weight in many quarters. Let us test them by the table.

The first two statements are indisputably true: the *s*-genitive was universal in older English and is, as far as the writer has noticed, practically universal in modern poetry. The second statement, that the possessive *s* is rare in prose except in the case of nouns denoting living beings, is not accurate. In the list of authors named below we see over 50 who wrote no poetry at all and who use this possessive in at least 275 passages.

As to the strict rule laid down by the authors quoted above, Professor John Earle² says, "This doctrine cannot be rigidly insisted upon." Professor Earle is right: his statement can be verified from the literature and from the usage of reputable speakers.

The following authorities use the possessive *s* of things without life:

John Mandeville.....	1	Pope	32
Malory	2	Richardson	1
Gorbodue	8	Jonathan Edwards.....	2
Shakespeare	29	Thomas Paine	1
Ben Jonson	2	Thomas Gray	2
Philip Sidney	1	Irving	1
Two Noble Kinsmen.....	1	Hazlitt	1
King James Bible.....	6	Byron	6
James Shirley	1	Scott	15
John Webster	1	Southey	7
Milton	3	Coleridge	1
Robert Herrick	3	James Montgomery.....	3
Bishop Burnet.....	1	Burns	3

¹ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 45.

² *Philology of the English Tongue*, 1887, p. 535.

Christopher North	7	Dean Trench	2
Lamb	1	F. W. Faber	1
Philip Freneau	4	F. T. Palgrave.....	1
Leigh Hunt	1	Sidney Lee	3
W. E. Channing.....	1	Henry van Dyke.....	2
Keble	1	Sidney Lanier	3
Wordsworth	1	P. H. Hayne.....	81
Thomas Campbell	6	J. F. Genung.....	19
Cowper	1	William James	3
George Eliot	2	Ruskin	2
Emerson	3	T. B. Aldrich	1
Thackeray	6	E. L. Godkin.....	1
Wendell Phillips	5	Mrs. H. Ward.....	3
Motley	2	J. F. D. Maurice.....	1
Thoreau	3	A. H. Clough.....	30
Longfellow	7	T. N. Page.....	1
Poe	9	H. N. Hudson.....	1
Cooper	1	E. B. Browning.....	10
Walt Whitman	3	Bret Harte.....	6
Dickens	2	Stopford Brooke.....	8
Bayard Taylor	112	G. K. Chesterton	2
Carlyle	1	D. G. Mitchell.....	5
Hawthorne	31	George William Curtis.....	1
Bryant	3	John Burroughs	1
Holmes	5	Price Collier	11
Churton Collins.....	3	John Fiske	8
Matthew Arnold.....	27	G. W. Cable.....	17
J. R. Lowell	15	Katharine Lee Bates.....	1
J. A. Froude.....	4	Stevenson	2
J. G. Whittier.....	28	H. W. Mabie	1
Browning	43		

Here are 87 authorities and 700 passages. If one man, in a limited course of reading, has recorded this number, how many thousands of examples might be gathered from the literature? The statements of Marsh, Sweet, Hill, Herrick and Damon, Jespersen, and Genung fall to the ground and Earle's is the only safe one.

Let us draw some inferences from the table.

Genung does not use the "parsimony and caution" that he

urges upon the student: in his college textbooks the writer has seen at least nineteen cases of the *s* under discussion.

The critics and verbalists should draw a clear distinction between the prose and the poetical use of this construction. If it is in the nature of personification, as some say, it should certainly be treated as a legitimate poetic license. It is exceedingly common in Bayard Taylor, Paul H. Hayne, Robert Browning, Clough, Shakespeare, and other poets. The possessive *s*, however, is not limited to poetry: it is strong in Scott, Hawthorne, Genung, Price Collier, Cable, and other prose writers.

It is very convenient. It often saves a plethora of phrases, especially *of*-phrases. It is rapid and concise, making for rapidity. Try the *of*-phrase in the two sentences at the head of this section and feel how the genius of the writers led them to the old syntax; the "phrasal genitive" would be intolerable.

It is a survival of the old inflectional genitive; why should it be so much condemned by the grammarians and rhetorical scholars? It is certainly vigorous in periodical literature and in the best current literature of the day.

It would be impossible to exhaust this subject; the number of passages could be increased indefinitely. It is almost impossible to read any good book by a reputable writer without seeing this interdicted locution at frequent intervals; the rule is not based upon the literature.

It may be well to quote a few more passages from standard prose literature. Ruskin (*Sesame and Lilies*) says, "each of them placed him at his *table's* head, and all feasted in his presence"; "Men shall bow before it, . . . build palaces for it, feast with it at their *tables'* heads all the night long," etc. Matthew Arnold (*Essays*) says, "this state of things is the true basis for the creative *power's* exercise"; "it is a great thing to have this part of your *model's* general effect already given you in your metre" (*On Translating Homer*). Motley in the

Dutch Republic says, "Officered by many other seions of *England's* aristocracy." Poe in his *William Wilson* says, "Yet in fact—in the fact of the *world's* view—how little was there to remember! The *morning's* awakening, the nightly summons to bed," etc.; "let us forbear praising the epic on the *effort's* account." (*The Poetic Principle*.) Hawthorne in *The Custom House* says, "They spoke with far more interest and unction of their *morning's* breakfast, or *yesterday's, today's, or tomorrow's* dinner, than of the shipwreck of forty or fifty years ago, and all the *world's* wonders which they had witnessed with their youthful eyes . . ." "one of the most wonderful specimens of wintergreen that you would be likely to discover in a *lifetime's* search." Emerson (*Love*) says, "it may seem to many men, in revising their experience, that they have no fairer page in their *life's* book than the delicious memory of some passages," etc. Froude says, "that was he who, when the *earth's* mighty ones were banded together to crush him under their armed heels, spoke but one little word." (*Lives of the Saints*.)

The writer is no special pleader for the old inflectional genitive; in fact he generally uses the phrasal genitive. The object of the foregoing discussion is to show that the *s*-genitive is still vigorous in the literature and that the statements of many textbook writers are too sweeping. Why not say, "The phrasal genitive is used more in both prose and poetry, especially in the former"?

XCH

POSSESSIVE CASE AS ANTECEDENT TO A RELATIVE PRONOUN

Nor ask

Her name to *whom* ye yield it till her time
To tell you. (*Tennyson*.)

Had he inherited a portion of the great *legislator's* prophetic powers, *whose* statue we had been contemplating, *etc.* . . . (*Coleridge*.)

Should the possessive case be used as antecedent to a relative pronoun?

Sentences like those quoted above are found all through the literature. In the first sentence, *her*, the possessive pronoun, is the antecedent of *whom*; in the second, the possessive *legislator's* is the antecedent of *whose*. In regard to this construction, A. S. Hill¹ says, "an archaism allowable in verse but to be avoided in prose." Genung² says, "an antecedent is not prominent enough by being in the possessive case; it ought to be either nominative or objective." Here we see two of our best rhetorical scholars condemning the *possessive+relative clause*.

Let us turn to some of our best grammarians. Mätzner³ treats this construction in his grammar, quoting examples from Shakespeare, Milton, Addison, Cowper, Byron, and Scott, about twelve cases altogether. He traces it as far back as Chaucer. Kellner⁴ recognizes this construction, tracing it from about A.D. 1330, through Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton. He says, "Owing to the original meaning of *my=of me*, a possessive pronoun is often antecedent to a relative one." Baskervill and Sewell⁵ in their grammar say, "The

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 433.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 89.

³ *English Grammar*, (Grece's translation) III. p. 218.

⁴ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 190.

⁵ *English Grammar*, p. 285.

possessive forms of personal pronouns and also of nouns are sometimes found as antecedents of relatives. This usage is not frequent. The antecedent is usually nominative or objective, as the use of the possessive is less likely to be clear." Abbott¹ says, "An antecedent is rarely implied in a *possessive* adjective, . . . but this is common in Shakespeare." Notice that the grammarians do not condemn the construction; only one of the three books quoted criticizes it at all unfavorably. Note, again, that Kellner says "often" found, while Abbott and Baskervill quote sentences from Scott, De Quincey, Macaulay, Ruskin, Charles Brockden Brown, and Thackeray, two of whom are not in our table.

The writer has recorded the following cases:

Chaucer	1	Dr. Johnson	2
Malory	3	Sterne	1
Latimer	1	Christopher North	2
King James Bible	7	Franklin	5
Massinger	1	Southey	1
Ben Jonson	2	Coleridge	2
Marlowe	14	Thomas Campbell	1
Shakespeare	16	Lamb	4
Titus Andronicus.....	1	Irving	1
Donne	1	Scott	2
Milton	9	Hallam	2
Izaak Walton.....	1	De Quincey	4
Sir Thomas Browne.....	5	George Eliot	2
Jeremy Taylor	1	Jean Ingelow	1
Prayer Book.....	1	Mrs. Gaskell	1
Joseph Hall.....	1	Matthew Arnold	1
Dryden	2	Macaulay	3
Addison	2	Thackeray	10
Steele	1	Lowell	3
Swift	1	Longfellow	1
Burnet	3	Poe	1
Prior	1	Tennyson	6
Pope	3	Carlyle	2
Boswell	7	Phillips Brooks	1

¹ *How to Parse*, p. 279. *Shakespearian Grammar*, § 218.

Motley	1	Bryant	1
Holmes	2	Mrs. Browning	1
G. W. Cable	1	A. H. Clough.....	2
Dean Trench	2	Browning	6
W. D. Whitney.....	1	Phoebe Cary.....	3
P. H. Hayne.....	3	D. G. Rossetti.....	1

The lists show more than 60 authors and more than 150 cases of the construction in one course of reading.

The *possessive+relative* is a survival. It is one of the last strongholds of the Anglo-Saxon inflectional genitive, resisting the sweep of the phrasal genitive. Probably it is on its way to ultimate extinction but is far from extinct, as our statistics and the statement of Kellner prove pretty clearly. Henry Sweet says that this locution is not heard in spoken English; but we might like to use it occasionally if the purists would permit it. If this construction is important enough to attract the attention of foreign English scholars, why need we native-born students of the language treat it as an interloper? If the old possessive case must die, why need we pull the pillow from under its head? The language will let it go if it is old useless luggage.

Looking back for a moment—Hill says, “To be avoided in prose.” Are writers on usage to dictate what is good English, or should they base their statements upon the usage of reputable writers? Our lists show that a large number of our best prose writers use this construction. Genung condemns this *s-genitive* on the ground that the antecedent is not prominent enough when in the genitive case. Is there anything in this statement? In inflected languages, is the genitive not frequently antecedent to a relative pronoun? Every student of languages will immediately answer, “Yes.” Genung, then, should give some other reason for his opposition.

The fact is there is no real objection to this construction except that it is rather uncommon, a remnant of the old inflectional system which broke down in the Middle English period.

If a writer or a speaker really needs it occasionally, why not let him use it? It has precedent, brevity, convenience, and authority in its favor.

As to Abbott's statement that the *possessive + relative pronoun* is rare, it may be said that the 150 cases cited above could easily be multiplied fourfold by a wider course of reading.

Thackeray uses this construction at least nine times in *Henry Esmond*; Milton, in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, at least nine times. Milton (*Paradise Regained*) says,

His lot *who* dares be singularly good.

Again :

I seek not mine, but *His*
Who sent me, and thereby witness whence I am.

Pope (*Essay on Criticism*) says,

His praise is lost, *who* stays, till all commend.

Yet shun *their* fault, *who*, scandalously nice,
Will needs mistake an author into vice.

Addison in the *Spectator* says, "a groundless report that has been raised, to a *gentleman's* disadvantage of *whom* I must declare myself an admirer," and, "This river is called to this very day, from *his* name *who* perished in it, the river Harpath." Matthew Arnold (*On Translating Homer*) says, "It must not be *Couper's* blank verse, *who* has studied Milton's pregnant manner with such effect," etc. Lowell (*Essay on Keats*) says, "The thought or feeling a thousand times repeated becomes *his* at last *who* utters it best."

XCIII

POUND AS A PLURAL

Students of Anglo-Saxon will remember that *pound* belonged to a group of words that made no change for the nominative and accusative plural. Most of these words, however, took on the standard *s*-plural at an early period. *Pound* long held on to its ancient plural, as it still does in unlettered English. The writer was interested to see how long this old form survived in the literature; hence this section.

Pound is used by Tyndale and is the regular plural in Latimer. Both forms occur in the Interlude of *Thersytes*. The plural *pound* occurs several times in the Bible and at least 30 times in Shakespeare. "I will take the ghost's word for a thousand *pound*," is the most familiar case in Shakespeare. It is used by Christopher Marlowe. In Queen Anne's day, Prior says, "I'll hold ten *pound* my dream is out"; and Pope, "Or let it cost five hundred *pound*." Benjamin Franklin uses it in his *Autobiography*.

These are the most recent cases that the writer has seen in the literature; there may be others later. Browning would not hesitate to use it.

In polite colloquial English and in the current literature of England, phrases like "three *pound* ten" (=£3. 10s.) are used very widely. "Twelve *pound* weight" is cited as good English by Nesfield.¹

¹ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 22.

XCIV

THE PREPOSITION AT THE END OF A SENTENCE

Many teachers and schoolbooks tell us that a sentence must never end with a preposition. Blair gave wide vogue to this canon. In his *Rhetoric*,¹ long a standard book, he says: "we should always avoid concluding with any of those particles which mark the cases of nouns, *of, to, from, with, by*. . . . This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun, and with reason." He adds that sentences of this kind are lacking in dignity and also that it is disagreeable for the mind to be left pausing upon a word which does not convey any idea or form any picture in the fancy. This view is still held in many quarters. It is clearly set forth in the school *Rhetoric* written by John S. Hart and revised by Professor J. M. Hart, his distinguished son. "End with words that deserve distinction," say Professors J. F. Genung and Barrett Wendell in their textbooks. This rule puts them in the same list as Blair and the Harts.

Professor George P. Krapp² is on the other side: he thinks the rule too strict. Professor A. S. Hill,³ also, combats this hard-and-fast rule and says that it is inconsistent with the practice of the good authors. He quotes passages from Shakespeare, Addison, Goldsmith, Jane Austen, Ruskin, Mrs. Oliphant, and Stevenson. Hill, however, goes on to say that, while good authors do not hesitate to end a sentence with a preposition when they think that clearness, force, or ease demands it, they often, perhaps usually, put the preposition elsewhere. This is no doubt true.

A pretty recent statement on this subject is from Jespersen,⁴

¹ Pp. 130, 131.

² *Modern English*, pp. 318, 319.

³ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 489, 490.

⁴ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 128.

the Danish scholar. He says that this is "a genuine English idiom of long standing in the language and found very frequently in all writers of natural prose and verse." Jespersen attributes the prejudice against it to the influence of Latin syntax upon English, and says that Dryden, no doubt under this influence, revised some of his sentences, *e.g.*, "The age I live in" to "The age in which I live."

The most recent statement on this subject is made by Kit-tredge and Farley in their grammar:¹ "A preposition may stand at the end of a sentence. . . . This order, though informal, is common in the best authors."

The following figures will speak for themselves:

Malory	2	Franklin	3
Thomas More.....	1	Lamb	33
Latimer	1	Scott	2
King James Bible.....	4	Christopher North	1
Shakespeare	33	Leigh Hunt	1
Fletcher and Shakespeare.....	1	Irving	1
Marlowe	2	Jane Austen	2
Massinger	33	Hawthorne	14
Dekker	1	Dean Trench	2
Lyly	1	Holmes	47
Beaumont and Fletcher :.....	1	Poe	2
Hobbes	1	Sir Henry Taylor	13
South	3	George Eliot	15
Milton	1	Herbert Spencer	2
Burnet	3	Huxley	2
Clarendon	1	Lowell	1
Baxter	1	Longfellow	1
Addison	17	Saintsbury	3
Dr. Johnson.....	1	G. W. Cable	1
Goldsmith	4	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
Fielding	14	Edwin Arnold	1
Dr. Blair	1	Henry Drummond.....	2
Cowper	2	Ruskin	5
George Campbell	2	Sir William Hamilton.....	1
Burke	2	Carlyle	22

¹ P. 149.

Kingsley	1	Morris	2
Froude	2	William Minto	5
Clough ..	2	Professor John Earle.....	3
Emerson	4	J. F. Genung.....	2
Bulwer	2	Bagehot	4
Thackeray	4	Freeman	5
Browning	5	D. G. Mitchell	1
Fiske	7	Mrs. H. Ward	1
Daniel Webster	1	Stevenson	8
Phillips Brooks	4	Matthew Arnold	1

Here are 70 authorities, in over 300 passages, all the way from Malory to the present.

It is too strict to say that a sentence must never close with a preposition. We can say that it is not the regular habit of reputable authors to end a sentence in this way; but this rule, like all other "hide-bound" rules, is subject to numerous exceptions. We could go on indefinitely collecting examples from many reputable authors. It is true that it is better to end a sentence with a word that "deserves distinction," provided we do not sacrifice something more important. There are times, however, when to put the preposition before its noun or pronoun would be almost intolerable. For instance, John Fiske says, "In 1640, King Charles found it impossible to get on any longer without a parliament, and he summoned one which he was never afterward able to get rid of." "*Of which* he was never afterward able to get rid," shall we say? No; that would be out-purizing the purists and would also destroy the cadence of the sentence.

The language has never positively required the preposition to stand close to its "object." In the Anglo-Saxon period the preposition frequently stood near the end of the clause, just before the verb at the end, and far away from its noun or pronoun; *e.g.*, "The house which he for many years happily *in* lived" would be good Anglo-Saxon. This survived in Middle English; *e.g.*, Chaucer says, "And mo than I kan make *of* menciou." In *Piers Plowman* we have "that I before *of*

seyde.” The preposition at the extreme end of the sentence is probably due to Scandinavian influence, as Toller suggests in his *Outlines of the History of the English Language*.¹

In public discourse and in conversation, this rule is violated very frequently. The speaker gets his relative pronoun straight, “which,” for instance; but not until he gets near the end of his sentence does he fully realize that his relative needs a preposition; e.g., “We venerate the house, however humble its appearance, *which* a great man was born *in*.” After getting almost through the sentence, it would be puristic and pedantic to go back and say “in which.”

In this connection it may be said that it is pretty common for good writers to end an internal clause with a preposition: this also used to be condemned in many schoolrooms.

We may now pass on to quote a few sentences from eminent authors. Addison in the *Spectator* says, “there are very few celebrated books, either in the learned or the modern tongues, which I am not acquainted *with*”; “It is certain the trunk-maker has saved many a good play, and brought many a graceful actor into reputation, who would not otherwise have been taken notice *of*.” Burke in *Conciliation* says, “I charge therefore to this new and unfortunate system the loss not only of peace, of union, and of commerce, but even of revenue, which its friends are contending *for*”; “your colonies become suspicious, restive, and untractable, whenever they see the least attempt to wrest from them by force or shuffle from them by chicanery, what they think the only advantage worth living *for*.” Froude (*Erasmus and Luther*) says, “Wanting sadly in many qualities which the liberal mind cannot dispense *with*,” and, “little if at all better than the popes and cardinals whom they were fighting *against*.” Hawthorne (*Custom House*) says, “Thus, by an inevitable necessity, as a magnet attracts steel filings, so did our man of business draw to himself the difficulties which everybody met *with*,” and, “to

¹ P. 150, note.

find how utterly devoid of significance, beyond that circle, is all that he achieves, and all he aims *at*." Ruskin in *The Crown of Wild Olives* says, "doing them at nights carefully, with her bandage off, and through acutest spectacles (the only modern scientific invention she cares *about*)."

XCV

PRETTY AS AN ADVERB

We sometimes see letters in the query columns of the papers and periodicals asking whether it is right to say "It is *pretty* warm, *pretty* cool," etc. The writer was interested in watching this use of the word in the literature.

The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Bunyan, Addison, Sheridan, and Goldsmith. Webster recognizes it, with a passage from Atterbury. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Burke. Worcester and the Standard recognize it. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Florio, Massinger, Alexander Hamilton, Fielding, Sheridan, Thomas Hughes, and Bryce. Baskervill and Sewell¹ say that "it has a wider adverbial use than it gets credit for," and cite the following authors as using it: Fielding, Defoe, Burke, Franklin, Holmes, Dickens, Kingsley, Thackeray, Prescott, De Quincey, Emerson, T. B. Aldrich.

The writer has recorded the following passages:

Pepys	1	Boswell	5
John Evelyn	1	Burke	1
Jonathan Edwards.....	1	Goldsmith	1
Defoe	3	Chesterfield	5
Addison	4	George Campbell	5
Swift	2	Franklin	3
Fielding	30	Coleridge	2
Dr. Johnson	3	Scott	1

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 186.

De Quincey	3	William Minto.....	2
Hazlitt	1	J. A. Froude.....	1
Lamb	14	J. R. Lowell.....	1
Poe	5	John Fiske	10
Hallam	8	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
Bryant	1	Henry Bradley	1
Bulwer	5	W. D. Whitney.....	1
Hawthorne	2	George P. Marsh.....	1
E. A. Freeman.....	3	Bret Harte	1
Thomas Hughes	3	Brander Matthews	2
Grote	1	James Bryce	2
Browning	1	Lounsbury	7
Macaulay	4	Holmes	11
Thackeray	25	Kittredge and Greenough.....	3
Mrs. Gaskell	12	G. W. Cable.....	4
Dickens	7	William James	1
George Eliot.....	3	J. F. Genung.....	2
Matthew Arnold.....	1	Stevenson	15

Here are about 60 of the best essayists, scholars, novelists, and historians of the last 250 years in at least 200 passages.

Of course the word is of the "free-and-easy" type; it would hardly be used in the most solemn places; is rather on the colloquial order. The word is too commonplace for poetry. Only one example in our list, the one from Browning, is taken from poetry, and that of the conversational order, where a character is speaking in monodrama. Then, Browning is a "free lance" in grammar, as we shall see in our section on the "split infinitive."

This use of *pretty* is strong in Lamb, Mrs. Gaskell, Thackeray, and Stevenson. It is suited to their free-and-easy style of writing. As said in treating *mighty* (page 161), words, even in literature have different grades, are not all equally suited to the high style or to sacred discourse. For instance, a preacher would hardly say, "The disciples were *pretty glad* when they saw their master." Nor would he say *mighty glad*; though good old Hugh Latimer might say either. Yet we should cheerfully permit it to a Stanley or to the present

Bishop of London: language "courtesies to great kings" of thought.

Dean Swift in the *Tatler* says, "when I seemed *pretty* much bent upon going, they ordered the stable door to be locked." Addison in the *Spectator* says, "But where the age and circumstances of both parties are *pretty* much upon a level, I cannot but think the insisting upon pin-money is very extraordinary," and, "We sat *pretty* late over our punch." Matthew Arnold (*On Translating Homer*) says, "wherever one finds such a theory announced (and one finds it *pretty* often), it is generally followed by an explosion of pedantry." Macaulay (*Earl of Chatham*) says, "the other, who is represented as a most respectable specimen of the young aristocracy, and something of a virtuoso, is described as spelling *pretty* well for a lord." Lowell in his essay *On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners* says, "The Dutch had thriven under it *pretty* well, and there was hope that we could at least contrive to worry along."

The literature is full of such sentences.

XCVI

THE PROGRESSIVE PASSIVE VERB PHRASE

Man as yet *is being made*. (*Tennyson*.)

The progressive passive verb phrase is avoided by some excellent speakers and writers. They will not say "My book *is being printed*" but "*is printing*." Yet a distinguished scholar recently told the author of this volume that the progressive passive phrase is too well established to need defense. Is he not mistaken? Are not Richard Grant White's¹ attacks upon this phrase still reprinted in Boston and read by thousands of earnest people? Do not many Americans avoid it?

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 334-363.

Grammarians have been fighting the progressive passive verb phrases for a long time. In 1857 Professor J. W. Gibbs,¹ of Yale, published an article which he had had in his desk since 1846, in which he, while admitting that the phrase was "quite common, particularly in the public newspapers," raised several "important objections" to the locution. He argued for "The house *is building*." He said that "The house is being built" is too formal and pedantic; that it is not found in the Bible; that the phrase *being built* is twisted from its proper meaning; and that, as far as he knew, the phrase in question did not have "the support of any respectable grammarian." How times change! To us it seems that "The house *is building*" sounds formal and pedantic. As to his second objection: we do not expect to find all of our present-day locutions in the King James Bible: that is a treasure-house of old words and phrases, but too antiquated in style to serve as an absolute criterion for modern English. As to the sanction of grammarians: Gibbs forgot for the nonce that grammarians do not make language but merely record usage. He forgot also that language develops new locutions as it needs them.

In 1859 George P. Marsh attacked this locution in his *Lectures on English*, calling it "clumsy and unidiomatic." He went on to say that this phrase did not originate in the common sense of the people but "in the brain of some grammatical pretender." He argued stoutly for the form *is making* in the sentence at the head of this section. A few years later, Richard Grant White² attacked *is being done* with great vehemence. White's books had considerable influence and are still popular in some quarters. Quackenbos,³ though not so warm as White, says, "It is at present more elegant and more idiomatic to say, 'The house *is building*' than 'The house *is being*

¹ *Philological Studies*, p. 90.

² *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 334-363.

³ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 236.

built.'' This statement stands in his latest edition, published in 1896. In 1900 Genung¹ in his school *Rhetoric* said, "Grammarians prefer *is doing, is building*, etc., when not ambiguous, to passives of this class." In 1902 Professor A. S. Hill,² after giving a block of sentences in which phrases of this group occurred, corrected them, and then made the following statement: "Passive forms like those given under II have recently, perhaps within a century, come into common use. They have been stigmatized as bad English; but they are found in the works of some good authors, and they are occasionally conducive to clearness. When, however, as in these examples, active forms are so familiar that they may be used without creating obscurity or savoring of affectation, they are preferable to passive forms; for they are less clumsy and more forcible." Cardinal Newman, it is said, was opposed to this locution all his life.³ Professor Earle,⁴ though favorable to it in 1871, was non-committal in 1887; he was probably influenced by the opinions of White, George P. Marsh, and other students of English who were opposed to it. Let us see what defenders it has had in the days since White and Marsh attacked it.

In 1864 Dean Alford⁵ said, "is so completely naturalized, that it would be vain to protest against it, or even to attempt to disuse it one's self." This shows how a distinguished Englishman felt in the '60's of the last century. The author's table and Fitzedward Hall's list below will show how many great authors were using it at that time.

In 1873 Fitzedward Hall⁶ defended the locution very staunchly. He criticized Marsh and White vehemently and argued that their hostility to the phrase was utterly unrea-

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 318.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 452, 453.

³ See Earle's *Philology of the English Tongue*, 1887, p. 552 and note.

⁴ *Philology of the English Tongue*, p. 552.

⁵ *The Queen's English*, 1866, pp. 167, 168.

⁶ *Modern English*, pp. 321-359.

sonable and simply due to their fear of innovation. Hall, while not attempting to give the genesis of the phrase, argued that it was needed in the language and said that it had been used by some of the best authors for at least seventy-five years. He quotes passages from the following:

Southey	De Quincey
Coleridge	Newman
Lamb	Bishop Wilberforce
Shelley	Ruskin
Landor	Freeman
Jeremy Bentham	Baring-Gould
Young	Matthew Arnold
Dr. Thomas Arnold	Huxley

Dr. Hall added that it was "daily becoming more and more common" and that "the best written of the English reviews, magazines, and journals are perpetually marked by it." The Century Dictionary says, "Well established in popular speech, and will probably pass into correct literary speech." Professor W. D. Whitney¹ in 1875 said, "Awkward, but naturally formed and really unavoidable."

In 1879 Lounsbury² gave the history of this passive progressive verb phrase, treating it as an established part of the English verb system. This same scholar said³ in 1914 that the phrase is perfectly established in the language. In 1885 Professor W. D. Whitney⁴ said, "These progressive passive forms are still regarded by some as bad English, and carefully avoided; but they are also freely used even by writers of the first class, especially in England (less generally in America)." In 1886 T. L. Kington Oliphant⁵ said, "the idiom is now well established." In 1904 Henry Bradley,⁶ editor of the New

¹ *The Life and Growth of Language*, p. 102.

² *History of the English Language*, revised edition of 1894, pp. 169-173.

³ In a letter to the author of this volume.

⁴ *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 128, top.

⁵ *The New English*, II, 188.

⁶ *The Making of English*, p. 70.

English Dictionary, said, "The . . . passive forms, as in "the house *is being built*", "he was *being taught* to ride," were hardly known till near the end of the eighteenth century, and long afterwards they were condemned by sticklers for grammatical correctness. Yet the innovation was clearly needed."

If any honest doubter is not convinced by these quotations from several of the greatest English scholars of England and America, it is no doubt useless for this writer to argue any further.

However, it may be added that this phrase is found more or less frequently in the following:

Coleridge	Phillips Brooks
Southey	Lowell
De Quincey	John Fiske
Landor	Tennyson
Mrs. Gaskell	Ernest Rhys
Matthew Arnold	Churton Collins
Froude	H. W. Mabie
Clough	Charles Morris
Thackeray	Stopford Brooke
Dickens	G. W. Cable
Huxley	T. N. Page
Herbert Spencer	Saintsbury
Stevenson	

The two lists indicate that the phrase is used more by English than by American writers, as Whitney said in his *Essentials of English Grammar*.

John Fiske uses both *is building* and *is being built*. Lowell, while using the passive form occasionally, clings to the other; *e.g.*, "the great problems . . . which were ages *in solving*." Holmes says, "the Battle . . . *is fighting*, and *was fighting*"; "as if some game of life *were* quietly *playing*."

The main attacks upon this locution have come from Americans, and these attacks have no doubt affected American writers. Whatever the cause, the phrase is not very common in the best American authors.

As to the age of this locution. Richard Grant White¹ says that it was first used in literature by Robert Southey in 1795. Lounsbury says it first became common in the latter half of the eighteenth century. White's statement can now be amended. We find it in the letters of John Shillingford, about 1447-1448. He writes, "*wyn is being y put to sale*" (=wine *is being put to sale*): the phrase occurs twice. Again: in the *Letters of the Court of James I.* (1603-1615) we read, "*Italy is being held dangerous.*" In 1769 one of Foote's characters says, "*an opera is being acted.*" So that the phrase was lurking somewhere in England for several hundred years, biding its time for adoption. Oliphant says that it originated in the West country. This, if true, will explain why it started out in standard literature with Coleridge and Southey, as these poets spent a good deal of their time in southwestern England. As there were no "grammatical pretenders" in the West country at that early day, the statement of Marsh in an earlier paragraph may be disregarded.

The genesis of this phrase may be given briefly. It started out in Anglo-Saxon in the form *on byldung* (=on building), where *on* means *in*. This changed to *in building*. Then it became *a-building*, where *a* is a shortened form of *on*. Then the preposition began to drop out, giving the phrase *is building*. Meantime *is being built* had, as already said, made its appearance sporadically in the literature.

The form *in building*, etc., runs through literature for centuries. The King James Bible says, "it was in building"; Thomas Gray, "bridge is now in building"; Lowell, "problems agès in solving." The King James Bible says, also, "the ark . . . was a-preparing"; G. W. Cable, "Gun-carriages were a-making."

For the next step we find Shakespeare has, "while gracee is saying"; Milton, "was building"; Addison, "was preparing"; Dr. Johnson, "were printing." Coleridge says, "a

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, edition of 1890, p. 348.

wall that is whitewashing"; Holmes, "is fighting"; Browning, "hops are picking." Certainly the language needed a new construction to meet such cases as the last four.

We have seen two older forms in use at the same time in Bible English. In recent English we can show all three modern forms in the same author: G. W. Cable, in *Dr. Sevier*, says, "gun-carriages were a-making", "the rams were building", "big guns were being cast"—three forms in one sentence.

White and Hall argued vehemently. One spent his energies trying to show that *is being done* violates logic, analogy, and precedent, the "parents" of language, as he calls them. The other argued just as stoutly that *is being built* does not violate good sense and reason and is not opposed to "the genius of the language." Both these writers were on the wrong track, groping in the dark; language asks no odds of either precedent, reason, or analogy. Ordinarily she is guided by these gentle maidens, but, when she is in a dilemma and wishes to get to some point as speedily as possible, she breaks away from these guides and leaves them gasping behind her. In this respect language can be compared to an army. Ordinarily it moves along the old roads that have been used for ages. These are convenient and serve for ordinary campaigns. But if an emergency arises; if the enemy is to be surprised, or any sudden *coup de guerre* is resolved upon, the engineer corps advances, cuts new roads amid the crash of falling timber, and moves the army through fields and pastures never before traveled by wheel or horsehoof. Precedent, reason, and analogy are the "parents" of language generally; but "necessity is the mother of invention" in language as in other matters.

To show the development of this phrase in modern English, a few complete sentences will be given.

Bishop Latimer, preaching before King Edward VI in 1550, said, "And before that Tenterton steeple was *in building*, there was no manner of speaking of any flats or sands

that stopped the haven." The King James Bible (1611) says, "And the house, when it was *in building*, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither"; "And the word of the Lord came to Solomon, saying, Concerning this house which thou art *in building*," etc.; "When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was *a-preparing*," etc. Addison (*Spectator*) says, "While supper *was preparing*, he enlarged upon the happiness of the neighboring shire." Dr. Johnson (Boswell's *Johnson*) writes in 1775, "Maps *were printing* in one of the rooms." When maps are printing and walls are whitewashing, the language will look for a better phrase elsewhere or make one. The passive phrase was coming into considerable use about the time of Johnson and of Coleridge, but the older ones have persisted to the present time in standard authors.

In the nineteenth century the passive phrase became well established. Tennyson was quoted at the head of this section. Matthew Arnold says, "I am disposed rather to regard it as a pause in which the turn to a new mode of spiritual progress *is being accomplished*." Froude (*Erasmus and Luther*) says, "the mind of the world was *being reformed* in the best sense by the classics of Greece and Rome"; "Sir Richard . . . was then shot through the body while his wounds *were being dressed*, and again in the head." (*Forgotten Worthies*.) (But Froude says in his essay on Homer, "in the distance a banquet *preparing* under the trees.") Stevenson (*Travels with a Donkey*) says, "even in my great chamber the air *was being renewed* all night long."

In conclusion it may be said that, although the passive phrase is "now well established," the active form is persisting both in literature and in the vocabulary of some highly educated men and women. To set a few earnest seekers after truth straight in the matter is the object of this unusually long section of this volume. When such popular writers as Macaulay, Carlyle, and Poe say, "His book was printing,"

“a house preparing”, “preparations were making”, “a meal is getting,” the passive phrase is hardly too well established not to need some discussion. Probably the language will keep both “is printing” and “is being printed.”

XCVII

PROVEN AS A PARTICIPLE

The Century Dictionary says, “an improper form, lately growing in frequency.” It quotes Herbert Spencer as using it. A. S. Hill¹ and Genung² condemn it in their textbooks on rhetoric. The Standard Dictionary says, “an irregular form, [used] in legal phrases.” Whitney³ calls it “an unsupported anomaly.”

T. L. K. Oliphant⁴ cited it as a Northern form in the Scotch law phrase “not *proven*,” seen about 1350.

Worcester says, “*Sometimes proven*,” and quotes P. J. Bailey. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Landor, Gladstone, Tennyson, and some minor writers. Webster recognizes it, quoting Thackeray and Jowett. The most ardent defender of *proven* is Professor Lounsbury, who devotes three pages to it in his *The Standard of Usage in English*.⁵ He finds it quite frequently in Tennyson; also in Bulwer, Lowell, Thackeray, and Herbert Spencer. Lounsbury says, “Some authors of repute employ it; some avoid it. . . . It is more than likely that it is destined to establish itself permanently in the language of literature.” *Proven* is used at least seven times in Tennyson’s *Idylls of the King* and twice in his *Aylmer’s Field*. The writer has seen it once in Huxley; twice in Kipling’s serious verse; once in Fitz-Greene Halleck’s

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 148.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 325.

³ *The Life and Growth of Language*, p. 75.

⁴ *The New English*, I, 55.

⁵ Pp. 62-65.

poetry; once in Miss Katharine Lee Bates's *Religious Drama*. Huxley, however, generally uses *proved*.

Of course *prove* is a weak verb and has no historicaal claim, so to speak, upon the *-en* participle; but as all scholars know, the two classes have been shifting a little for many centuries.

Worcester's statement is correct: "sometimes *proven*." Whitney's statement, "an unsupported anomaly," is too severe. Lounsbury's prophecy is hardly warranted when only ten or twelve cases have been found in seventy-five thousand pages of literature; but Tennyson uses it seventeen times, as the concordance to his poetry shows. *Proved*, however, is supreme in the literature as a whole.

If one great author can establish a form, Tennyson has established *proven*; but he also uses *proved*.

In America, *proven* has considerable vogue in polite society and in the best journals.

Tennyson (*Gareth and Lynette*) says,

Why, Gawain, when he came
With Modred hither in the summer-time,
Ask'd me to tilt with him, the *proven* Knight.

there be many who deem him not,
Or will not deem him, wholly *proven* king.

Not *proven*, who swept the dust of ruin'd Rome
From off the threshold of the realm, *etc.*

Miss Bates has no doubt heard *proven* in Massachusetts all her life: the writer has heard it in Virginia.

Probably the Scotch law phrase "not *proven*" has helped to extend the use of *proven*; and this phrase itself indicates that the form is not a neologism but has its roots in the past. (See Oliphant's statement above.)

Proved is far more common in the literature, has no enemies, and does not put one on the defensive. Yet we may feel that we do not like to part with *proven* after hearing it all our

lives from good speakers and careful talkers. If so, we have some high authority to support us; but George Campbell would advise us to use the more common form.¹

XCVIII

QUIT = LEAVE, GO AWAY FROM

The writer long had a prejudice against the word *quit*; in his mind it was associated somehow with the illiterate or the half-educated. For that reason he watched the word in literature and found that it has been in reputable use for several centuries. It was used frequently by Dr. Johnson in the eighteenth century; by Jane Austen, Bulwer, and Thackeray in the nineteenth. It is an exceedingly common word in Thackeray, could probably be found hundreds of times in his novels. Macaulay, also, uses it very frequently, though the writer has recorded only 25 cases of the word in his writings.

Quit is used by the following authors:

Shakespeare	8	Boswell	9
Sir Thomas Browne	2	Dr. Johnson	14
Massinger	1	Thomas Warton	3
Lord Bacon	2	Sharon Turner	4
Defoe	4	Alexander Hamilton	1
Bishop Burnet	5	Fielding	26
Swift	4	Burke	1
Addison	3	Dr. H. Blair	1
Steele	1	Franklin	4
Dryden	2	Freneau	2
Pope	10	Cowper	1
Prior	4	Southey	2
Baxter	1	Byron	3
Jeremy Taylor	3	Coleridge	2
Milton	2	De Quincey	9

¹ "When those (the authorities) on one side greatly preponderate, it is in vain to oppose the prevailing usage." *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Bk. II, chap. II, section I.

William Hazlitt	4	Matthew Arnold	4
Lamb	10	Browning	7
Christopher North	1	Carlyle	8
Hallam	1	Motley	2
Scott	6	Newman	1
Wordsworth	9	Francis Palgrave	1
Jane Austen	15	Poe	16
A. H. Clough	3	Bayard Taylor	2
Cooper	5	Dean Trench	1
Emerson	6	Thackeray	44
Froude	1	Sir Henry Taylor	5
Mrs. Gaskell	2	Stevenson	2
Lady Charlotte Guest	1	John Fiske	2
Hawthorne	10	Henry Adams	1
D. G. Rossetti	1	G. W. Cable	1
Ruskin	1	Churton Collins	2
Holmes	3	Professor John Earle	1
Jean Ingelow	4	James Bryce	1
Douglas Jerrold	1	Stephen Phillips	1
Macaulay	25	John Tyndall	1
William Minto	1	Mrs. H. Ward	4
D. G. Mitchell	1	W. D. Whitney	1

The word is used more in England than in America: a careful reading of the table will show that about three-fourths of the examples are from English literature. It will be noticed, also, that the largest figures are from English authors. For instance, an English author will say, "They *quit* (or *quitted*) Rome early in the year," where an American author would be more likely to say, "They left Rome."

With the foregoing list of more than 70 reputable authors representing a very wide use of *quit*, we can no longer have a reasonable prejudice against the word; but

A man convinced against his will
Is of his own opinion still.

The following quotations will show how *quit* is used in the literature. Pope's hymn is familiar:

Vital spark of heav'nly flame,
Quit, oh, *quit* this mortal frame.

Burke (*Conciliation*) says, "But I *quit* the vantage-ground on which I stand, and where I might leave the burthen of the proof upon him." Addison in the *Spectator* says, "The genius, being moved with compassion towards me, bid me *quit* so uncomfortable a prospect"; "I was forced to *quit* my first lodgings, by reason of an officious landlady, that would be asking me every morning how I had slept." Matthew Arnold (*Function of Criticism*) says, "Or, to narrow our range, and *quit* these considerations of the general march of genius and of society," etc.; "its movement of ideas, by *quitting* the intellectual sphere and rushing furiously into the political sphere, ran, indeed, a prodigious and memorable course," etc. Macaulay says, "Fortunately for himself and for his country, he early *quitted* poetry," etc.; "Addison, made a rich man by his pension, and still retaining his fellowship, *quitted* his beloved Oxford, and set out on his travels"; "Addison was consequently under the necessity of *quitting* London for Dublin."

Quit in the sense of *cease*, *stop*, is marked "chiefly colloquial" in the Century, but is recognized by several other dictionaries. "To quit London" is more literary than "to quit smoking."

XCIX

RECKON AND GUESS IN LITERATURE

Have *reckon* and *guess* in the sense of "think," etc., any literary standing? Or are they only provincialisms, properly blacklisted in all our schoolbooks?

All of the "lesser grammarians" and the minor verbalists condemn them mercilessly, and some of the major writers of textbooks and some of the lexicographers fail to show that they could possibly be used in modern literature.

1. RECKON

Webster says, "Provincial English and colloquial U. S." This authority gives no inkling that the word has any standing in literature in the sense of "think," "suppose." The Century, while showing from the King James Bible, Dean Swift, Foote, Walter Scott, and Harper's Magazine, that the word has been literary, says that it has come to be regarded as provincial or vulgar. The Encyclopedic Dictionary says, "Provincial in England and very common in the middle and southern states of America." Even Lounsbury,¹ the leader of our most charitable verbal critics, says, "once literary, which still remains common in the United States, especially in the South."

Let us trace *reckon* in the literature. The earliest case the writer has seen is in John Bale's *God's Promises*, written in 1538. Next, two passages from the Bible quoted in the Century Dictionary; viz., *Isaiah* 38:13 and *Romans* 8:18, which we leave the reader to look up for himself. The New English Dictionary, in showing the literary use of the word, quotes Joseph Glanvill (1636-80), the Bible, Swift, Fanny Burney, Gaskell, and Jowett.

An interesting passage from Swift is quoted in the Century: "I *reckon* it will appear to many as a very unreasonable paradox." To this the writer can add, "I do not *reckon* that we want a genius more than the rest of our neighbors." No doubt other passages from Swift could be produced. A little later, we find it used by Dr. Samuel Johnson in a letter: "I *reckon* George begins to shew a pair of heels." Just at this time, Foote was writing his plays, from one of which the Century quotes a *reckon*. About this same time Chesterfield uses it in a letter. Thomas Carlyle says: "In many intricacies Frederick has been; but never, I *reckon*, in any equal to this." (This is quoted by Professor Lounsbury.) Fitzedward Hall² puts it in *Our Grandfathers' English*, citing

¹ *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 32.

² *Modern English*, p. 251, and note.

Foote and Cowper as using it. Walt Whitman in *Leaves of Grass* says, "I *reckon* I behave no prouder than the level I plant my house by, after all." Browning (*The Flight of the Duchess*) says,

He told the crone, as I since *have reckoned*
By the way he bent and spoke into her ear.

This is a pretty straight pedigree, all the way from Bale to Browning.

Who does not respect this old word when he hears from eloquent lips that grand sentence, "For I *reckon*¹ that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us"? What hand will change that *reckon* to any one of its supposed equivalents?

The writer does not deny that *reckon* is at present not in good literary standing: he is only tracing its pedigree in literature, bringing it down from Bale to Browning. It has been shown that it was in good literary standing when our colonial sires emigrated from England and that they handed it down to their descendants. We shall close with a query: If *reckon* is entirely "provincial," or "colloquial U. S.," what shall we do with Browning? Under which head shall we classify him?

I reckon is treated separately by the New English Dictionary, which says, "formerly in literary English." This dictionary seems to regard *I reckon* as standing on a lower plane than the verb *reckon* in other collocations.

2. GUESS

Guess = "think," or "suppose," like *reckon*, is better than the textbooks make it. It is common in Chaucer and Wycliffe; was used by Gower, Shakespeare, Pope, Sheridan, Southey, and Wordsworth, so that it had an unbroken literary

¹ An excellent scholar has suggested that the Greek word used by Saint Paul means to "calculate." It did mean that originally, but afterwards meant "consider." In most of the languages, it will be found that the word used in translating the passage is equivalent to "think", "consider."

as localisms and colloquialisms, they have some literary value and some standing among modern authors, with a slight balance on the side of *reckon*.

C

REDUNDANT¹ THAT

What we might call redundant *that* is often heard in conversation and in platform English and sometimes gets into literature. For instance, Bishop Burnet in his *History of Our Own Times* writes, "And it was often said, *that* if Cromwell would have compounded the matter, and have given him a good round pension, *that* he might have been induced to resign his title to him." Here the second *that* is clearly redundant. Dr. Johnson, in a letter to Boswell dated Dec. 7, 1782, uses the same construction. Thomas Paine uses it at least four times. Recent cases are seen in the writings of a prominent English ecclesiastic, Prebendary C. A. Row; in Isaac D'Israeli, and in Phillips Brooks. There are two cases of this *that* in Anglo-Saxon literature, one in the *Chronicle* and the other in the prose *Legend of St. Andrew*. It occurs in Malory also.

Dr. Johnson in a letter to Boswell says, "You do not, since now you are the head of your house, think it worth your while to try whether you or your friend can live longer without writing, nor suspect *that* after so many years of friendship *that* when I do not write to you, I forget you." Isaac D'Israeli says: "It is hardly credible, *that* on the first introduction of the Chinese leaf, which now affords our daily refreshment; or the American leaf, whose sedative fumes made it so long a universal favorite; or the Arabian berry, whose aroma exhilarates its European votaries; *that* the use of those harmless novelties should have spread consternation," etc. The

¹ Not the same construction called by this name in Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar*.

distinguished Phillips Brooks uses this *that* more than once in his published addresses: "Shall I believe *that* until he comes to a change of his opinions and recognizes that there is indeed a ruling love, a great and fatherly God for all the world, *that* he has nothing to do with that God?" The last italicized *that* recapitulates the first.

The psychology of the redundant *that* is very simple: it is the desire of the writer or of the speaker to recapitulate, to renew the connection between the clause introduced by *that* (but interrupted by intervening words) and the main element of the sentence. The *that* under discussion, then, might be called the resumptive or recapitulative *that*.

It may be added that scholars have noticed that the syntax of English has a "short span", "short reach," or "short circuit" and needs words of recapitulation more than other languages. Under this same head we might put the Pleonastic Pronoun, treated in a previous section of this volume.

The *that* under discussion is common in the pulpit, on the platform, and in conversation, but rare in literature. The writer is not arguing for this construction: on the contrary, he thinks that it mars the beauty of a sentence. Having often heard this *that* used by well educated people and seen it frequently in reputable papers, he was interested to find it occurring sporadically in the literature.

CI

THE RELATIVE **THAT** BEFORE A PAUSE

An expression *that*, though intelligible, is no longer employed in ordinary unemotional discourse. (*J. F. Genung.*)

The use of *that* before a pause is condemned by some high authorities. Henry Sweet¹ says: "As it (*i.e., that*) is always pronounced with a weak vowel, it cannot take stress, and

¹ *New English Grammar*, § 2128.

hence cannot be followed by a pause. Thus we could not substitute it for *who* in "he is a man who, if . . ." Is this rule based upon a study of the literature?

Genung¹ takes the same position. He quotes approvingly from some writer: "*That* is not a good word to pause upon; when therefore it comes just at a pause *who* or *which* will often sound better. Example.—There are many persons *that* (better *who*), though unscrupulous, are commonly good-tempered, and *that* (better *who*), if not strongly incited by self-interest, are ready for the most part to think of the interest of their neighbors."

That these canons are not based upon the usage of good writers will appear from the table appended. Meantime let us quote a few passages from Genung's college textbooks: "habits *that*, far from eclipsing any mental talent, make all the writer's gifts more assured and self-perfecting";² "some thoughts *that*, reasoned out, would have comparatively little effect, might appeal strongly to the imagination";³ "there must necessarily remain a great deal *that*, in spite of the utmost skill, cannot be adequately reproduced in another language."⁴ These are but a fraction of the passages that might be found in Genung's volumes. We quote them to show that the rule is so strict that good writers like Genung are not bound by them.

The writer has recorded the following passages in which the relative *that* is used before a pause:

John Lyly	3	Burke	4
Bacon	5	John Adams	1
John Webster	1	Hazlitt	2
Bishop Burnet	1	Coleridge	1
Richard Steele	1	Wordsworth	2
Dr. Johnson	3	Lamb	2

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 94.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 232.

³ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 289.

⁴ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 320.

Christopher North	1	Lounsbury	1
Scott	2	Stephen Phillips	1
Prescott	1	Katharine Lee Bates.....	2
Trench	1	William Minto	1
Cooper	6	Tennyson	6
Holmes	1	Browning	3
Bulwer	1	D. G. Rossetti.....	1
Poe	1	G. W. Cable.....	2
Beaconsfield	1	Carlyle	1
De Quincey	12	Sir Henry Taylor.....	1
George Eliot	2	T. N. Page.....	2
Froude	1	J. F. Genung.....	16
Morris	2	Stevenson	1

Here we have 38 reputable authors from Elizabethan times to the present.

An interesting fact is that Genung is the worst violator of his own canon; but this does not injure his standing as a writer, since his practice conforms with that of many standard authors.

A point worth mentioning is that the conjunction *that* is very often used before a pause in literature and by public speakers. Would not the objections made to the relative hold good against the conjunction? Yet the latter is not questioned by rhetorical scholars and grammarians.

Let us quote a few passages from the literature.

Dr. Johnson (*Life of Shakespeare*) says, "He *that*, without diminution of any other excellence, shall preserve all the unities unbroken," etc. In this sentence, Dr. Johnson uses this interdicted *that* and uses it where Sweet intimates it would be intolerable. De Quincey uses it pretty frequently. He says (*A Sketch from Childhood*), "The Jews *that*, in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, were cursed in a certain contingency," etc.; "murders *that*, many centuries after all the parties to them—perpetrators, sufferers, avengers—had become dust and ashes," etc. Froude (*Words about Oxford*) says, "it is the connexion of the foundation

with the history of man—with the names *that*, like the flowers called ‘immortals,’ bloom,” etc. Carlyle (*Heroes and Hero Worship*) says, “Is it not strange *that*, after all the mountains of calumny this man has been subject to?” etc. Burke says (*Conciliation*), “for the sake of the weighty instruction *that*, I flatter myself, will necessarily result from it”; “at the very time *that*, by your conquests in America, your danger from foreign attempts in that part of the world was much lessened,” etc. Browning says (*The Ring and the Book*),

The wilding flower-tree-branch *that*, all those years,
She had got used to feel for and find fixed.

The true son-servant *that*, when parent bids
“Go work, son, in my vineyard,” makes reply
“I go, sir!”

The writer can see no valid objection to *that* before a pause.

CII

RELIABLE

The word *reliable* has been fought over a long time. In the '60's of the last century, Dean Alford,¹ in England, and Richard Grant White,² in America, condemned the word; the former, rather mildly; the latter, vehemently. White and others of his school argue that the verb is *rely upon*, and not *rely*, and that consequently the suffix *-able* should not be added to the verb to form an adjective. William Cullen Bryant took his stand with these verbalists and gave instructions that *reliable* should not be used in the columns of his paper, the *New York Evening Post*. George P. Marsh condemned it though using it occasionally. Genung³ gives it a half-hearted welcome, saying, “It has made a place for itself

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 253.

² *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 220-229.

³ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 326.

in usage, though careful writers generally prefer *trustworthy*." Could this statement be substantiated by a study of the literature?

In 1867 W. D. Whitney¹ discussed the word *reliable*. He does not commit himself as to its propriety, but shows that it might be given a trial. He says that it is "shut out from the best—or, at least, from the most exclusive—society in English speech." He shows, however, that the language has formed *laughable*, *unaccountable*, *indispensable* and others on the same basis as *reliable*, and that any objection valid against the last-named would hold good against the others. So that Whitney, while rather non-committal, really gave the word a helping hand just at the time when men like Alford and White were either opposing it or questioning it seriously. A few years later, Fitzedward Hall² defended *reliable* and named a large number of reputable writers that used it, among them:

Coleridge	George P. Marsh
J. S. Mill	Gladstone
Dickens	James Martineau
Charles Reade	G. O. Trevelyan
A. Trollope	Monier Williams
Bagehot	Leslie Stephen
Harriet Martineau	Saintsbury
Newman	Henry Sweet
Irving	Thomas Arnold
Daniel Webster	Edward Everett

Since that time, the word has steadily risen in favor. The Century Dictionary defends it, but says that it is shunned by many fastidious writers. It quotes passages from Coleridge, Irving, Gladstone, J. H. Newman, J. S. Mill, and Leslie Stephen, a strong sextette of authorities. Webster defends it, quoting some of the same, and also Martineau. Stormonth recognizes it. Worcester recognizes it, quoting three authors

¹ *Language and the Study of Language*, pp. 40, 41. .

² *Modern English*, pp. 320, 348.

and periodicals. One of the stanchest defenders of the word is Lounsbury.¹ He says that, while Coleridge introduced the word into good society, it was already in the language. He good naturedly twits those who will use *laughable*, *available*, and *indispensable*, and yet refuse to tolerate *reliable*, which, he says, belongs to the same category. Canby and four other Yale professors of English² use it at least four times in a textbook on rhetoric. O. F. Emerson uses it. The Rev. W. W. Skeat, though very warm on some other points of usage, uses *reliable* and defends³ it strenuously "against many frivolous and ignorant objections." (Skeat is always plain-spoken.) The New English Dictionary recognizes *reliable*, quoting Irving, Gladstone, Trevelyan, and some others not so well known. The last-named dictionary says, "Comparatively new word, sometimes called an Americanism." Walter Bagehot, Dickens, and George P. Marsh use it.

Besides the support of the authors cited above and a majority of the verbalists, scholars, and lexicographers, the word has the imprimatur of polite society and of many reputable speakers.

Jespersen,⁴ the Danish scholar, says, "it is difficult to see why *reliable* should be the most abused word of the English language. It is certainly formed in accordance with the fundamental laws of the language; it is short and unambiguous, and what more should be needed?" He goes on to show that it was in reputable use as early as 1624, and quotes Fitzedward Hall as proving that it had been in standard literature for over a hundred years. He also says that *trustworthy* is much less euphonious than *reliable*.

The writer may add that, while he has seen few cases of *reliable* in this course of reading, he has also seen very few cases of *trustworthy*.

¹ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 196, 197.

² *English Composition in Theory and Practice*.

³ *Students' Pastime*, p. xvii.

⁴ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, pp. 108, 109.

Professor O. F. Emerson says, "Thus from seven to ten divisions are made by different scholars, the most *reliable* authority at present placing the number at eight." Five English scholars of Yale¹ in a textbook on composition say, "If he is *reliable*, you can include his statements, and your opponents will have to respect them; if he is not *reliable*, you must omit the whole thing from your brief and argument"; "Now where there is only one cause and one effect, this argument is simple and *reliable*"; "If you have analyzed all the points in your brief under these heads and found them *reliable*, you may feel reasonably certain that the framework of your argument is sound."²

For the benefit of readers who prefer quotations from stylists rather than from scholars like Emerson, Skeat, and other specialists, we borrow the following sentence from the dictionaries: Newman says, "She (the Church) has now a direct command, and a *reliable* influence, over her own institutions, which was wanting in the middle ages." (*Lectures on University Subjects*.)

The Century in defining *dependable*, itself as vulnerable as the word under discussion, uses *reliable*. Both of them are offensive to some, though they have the sanction of some eminent writers.

CIII

REMEMBER OF

In *Henry VIII.*, Shakespeare says, "*I remember of* such a time." The phrase in italics is condemned as a vulgarism by A. S. Hill in his school Rhetoric.² Carlyle, in a letter to Emerson, speaking of Webster, says, "I have not traced as much of silent Berserker-rage, that I *remember of* in any other

¹ Canby and others: *English Composition in Theory and Practice*.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 304.

man.” Of course we cannot depend too much upon Carlyle, as he, to some extent, made his own dialect—“Carlylese.”

The phrase under discussion is out of date now: it is noticed here only because it was seen in three eminent authors and is heard occasionally in polite society.

CIV

RESURRECT

The verb *resurrect* is denounced so vehemently in most of the textbooks and dictionaries that one would hardly expect to find it in the literature. It is condemned by A. S. Hill,¹ Genung,² the Standard Dictionary, Webster's International, and the Century, not to speak of vehement verbalists without number.

The Oxford Dictionary, however, speaks a good word for it, explaining its origin and quoting Benham, Thomas H. Benton, Hawthorne, and Mrs. Oliphant as using it. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, quoting a passage from John Burroughs. Webster's Secondary School Dictionary, a recent book, recognizes it.

The present writer has seen the word in the writings or speeches of Thomas H. Benton, Professor F. L. Pattee, and Professor W. M. Baskervill, the two last-named being well-known English scholars.

While not recommending the word, the writer may say that it is an analogical formation from *resurrection*, what is called a “back-formation,” just as *beg* was formed from *beggar*. Again: it would be a useful word in the language. For instance, suppose some adverse critic of this volume wished to say, “This man is trying to *resurrect* some dead words and phrases,” but did not wish to use *resurrect*. If he said

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 235.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 327.

revive, his remark would lose a good deal of its pungency, as *resurrect* has the idea of wakening the dead with a loud blast of the last trump, while *revive* would convey the innocent idea of pouring a little water on a fainting lady's face. In other words, it tells how the speaker feels about the subject under discussion.

The word is used by Professor F. L. Pattee in his edition of Freneau's Poems: "He (the author) *resurrected* none of the material dropped from the 1795 collection," etc. John Burroughs says, "The centre, where the sportsman lies entombed, to be quickly *resurrected* when the game appears."

With the imprimatur of the great Oxford Dictionary, of Webster's recent imprint, of Hawthorne, John Burroughs, and several of our best minor writers, the word *resurrect* should certainly not be stigmatized.

Its congener *resurrectionist* seems to have no enemies, probably because it fills a definite place in the language not occupied by any other word.

CV

RETAINED OBJECT

At a shrine about Canterbury he was shown an old *shoe* which tradition called the saint's. (*J. A. Froude*.)

What is the syntax of *shoe* in the sentence above? Several of the best grammarians call it "the retained object"; the great German grammarian Mätzner¹ calls it "the object of the thing with the passive."

Quackenbos,² speaking of this construction, says, "protested against by all who respect pure English." (See the authors below who do not respect pure English.) Sweet says, "We hesitate over and try to evade such constructions." There is

¹ *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), II, 212-214.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 242.

a feeling among good teachers that a passive verb cannot possibly take an object.

In connection with our last statement, George P. Marsh,¹ one of the pioneers of English study in America, says, "Such combinations as 'He was given a *commission* in a new regiment' are employed by some of the best writers of the present day, as well as by those of an earlier period. . . . They make the language not less intelligible, but less artistic; less poetical, but not less practical, and they are therefore fully in accordance with those undefined tendencies which constitute the present drift of the English language."

Mätzner discusses the syntax of the noun after a passive verb. He cites passages from Shakespeare, the Earl of Chatham, Milton, Goldsmith, Fielding, Sheridan, Douglas Jerrold, Coleridge, Macaulay, and Bulwer. More recent grammarians who recognize and parse it are E. A. Abbott,² Jespersen,³ Carpenter,⁴ Nesfield,⁵ Baskervill and Sewell,⁶ Kittredge and Farley.⁷ They recognize not only the noun but the infinitive; *e.g.*, He was taught *to dance*.

Lounsbury⁸ defends this construction valiantly. He says that it made its appearance in the language in the twelfth century and names the following authorities in which this object is found:

Richard Rolle de Hampole	Bacon
Sir Amadas	Ben Jonson
Coventry Mysteries	Fletcher
Paston Letters	Milton
Blackstone	Dryden
Spenser	Swift
Shakespeare	Addison

¹ *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 246.

² *How to Parse*, p. 91.

³ *Progress in Language*, p. 232.

⁴ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 176.

⁵ *English Grammar Past and Present*, p. 55.

⁶ *English Grammar*, p. 242.

⁷ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 112.

⁸ *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 175ff.

Steele	Coleridge
Pope	Southey
Gray	Irving
Fielding	Carlyle
Richardson	Macaulay
Smollett	Dickens
Hume	Thackeray
Gibbon	George Eliot
Burke	Hawthorne
Goldsmith	Tennyson
Dr. Johnson	Matthew Arnold
Cowper	Ruskin
Crabbe	Disraeli
Wordsworth	Browning
Byron	Froude
Scott	Emerson
Jane Austen	Stevenson

The writer has seen the following cases :

Hugh Latimer	2	Mrs. Gaskell	1
Shakespeare	2	Encyclopedia Britannica	1
Jeremy Taylor	3	T. L. K. Oliphant	1
Pepys	1	Lowell	5
Pope	1	John Fiske	15
Goldsmith	2	S. Baring-Gould	6
Dr. Johnson	10	J. A. Froude	1
Christopher North	1	T. N. Page	2
Byron	1	G. W. Cable	1
Macaulay	12	O. F. Emerson	2
Cowper	1	J. M. Barrie	1
Hallam	1	Lounsbury	1
Milman	1	Stevenson	4
Audubon	1	Ernest Rhys	1
T. N. Talfourd	1	Sir Henry Taylor	3
Thomas Campbell	1	John Earle	1
Poe	2	Freeman	3
Bulwer	1	Huxley	2
Sir John Lubbock	1	Holmes	1

Here are about 80 authorities in all, besides others known to Professor Lounsbury.

This object is a striking feature of the English language. Marsh says it is regarded by foreigners as a monstrosity; yet he himself declares that it is fully in accordance with the "genius" of modern English. Why do the purists attack it? Simply because it baffles their grammatical perception; they think that everything must lend itself to parsing, as if English were not filled up with constructions that cannot and will not be parsed, but are labeled idioms and irregularities by the great grammarians. "I was denied *access* to the king"; "he was refused *admission*"; "we were taught *music*"; "we are told *that the earth is round*"—these are but a fraction of the familiar locutions that "the lesser grammarians" and the purists would banish from the language. As already said, the greater grammarians call this noun either "retained object" or "object of the thing after a passive verb." The fact is there; the name is a secondary matter.

Whatever we may call this noun, it certainly enriches the language. Some object to the name "retained object" on the ground that the noun was not always the object when the sentence was in the active form and hence should not be called "retained" when the sentence is passive in construction. This is true in some cases; but in all the phrases cited in the foregoing paragraph the nouns were objects of the active verb. "He refused me *admission*," when put in the passive form, becomes, "I was refused *admission* by him." What shall we call *admission* in the second sentence? Some purists say that the second sentence is not good English; and therefore not to be noticed by the grammarian. But that objection has been silenced if the opinions of eminent scholars and the usage of distinguished authors are to be considered. Mätzner's nomenclature is certainly good, but rather cumbrous for the school-room: "object of the thing with the passive." Why not abridge that into "Passive Object"? This would look well in our textbooks along with Direct Object, Indirect Object, Cog-

nate Object, etc., and would pacify those who do not like "retained object."

We need not notice the fact that foreigners call this object a monstrosity. It is a part of our language. It was evolved by our language centuries ago and is deeply imbedded in colloquial, platform, and written English. It is no more peculiar or idiomatic than many locutions found by us when we study foreign languages. Nor is it more idiomatic than some other English constructions or usages to which no objection is ever made.

Probably the most common form of this passive object is the noun clause after *am told*, *was told*, etc.; e.g., "I am told *that you have changed your politics*." Sentences like this are found on every page of our literature.

A few examples may be given.

Pope says,

A face untaught to *feign*; a judging eye,
That darts severe upon a rising lie.

Dr. Johnson in *Rasselas* uses this object at least nine times. He says, "By degrees the royal wanderers were taught *to understand* that they had for a time laid aside their dignity"; "we . . . were offered such *refreshments* as our masters were partaking." Jeremy Taylor in a sermon says, "then also He entered into a cloud, and was told a sad *story* what He was to suffer at Jerusalem." Macaulay says, "We are told that, while still a mere child, he stole away from his play-fellows to a vault in St. James's Fields." (Clause object.) "The natives had been taught that France was confessedly the first power in Europe." (Clause object again.)

Who would hesitate to say, "I am told that Mexico wishes to be annexed, but she should be denied admission"?

CVI

RIGHT AS AN ADVERB

Of his person and stature was the king
A man *right* manly strong. (*Rossetti*.)

The use of *right* modifying an adjective is called a provincialism by Quackenbos, A. S. Hill, and Genung in their textbooks. Does this include the literary use of the phrase, as in the type-sentence from Rossetti? Or does it mean only the colloquial, "I am *right* glad to hear that"?

Right has been modifying adjectives for five hundred years. It is common in Chaucer, the Miracle Plays, and Malory. It is strong in Shakespeare, Carlyle, Kingsley, and William Morris, besides occurring here and there in many other authorities. It is recognized by the Century Dictionary, which quotes from the *Merlin* and from Milton. Webster, after quoting passages from Chaucer, Tyndale, and Shakespeare, says, "now chiefly prefixed to titles." The Encyclopedic Dictionary, after quoting from the Bible, says, "little used except in titles." The Standard says, "archaic or colloquial except in some titles; as, *Right Reverend*." Worcester says, "very." The New English Dictionary says, "archaic," and quotes Gray, Coleridge, Disraeli, Thoreau, and Edward Fitzgerald.

The writer has recorded the following passages:

Malory	33	Prior	1
John Bale	3	Coleridge	1
Latimer	3	Wordsworth	1
Heywood	1	Scott	3
John Foxe	1	Christopher North.....	1
Shakespeare.....	15	Hawthorne	1
Prayer Book	3	Landor	1
Two Noble Kinsmen.....	2	Thackeray	1
King James Bible.....	1	Carlyle	15

Kingsley	10	Andrew Lang	5
Tennyson	8	Swinburne	6
Edward Fitzgerald.....	1	Browning	1
J. R. Lowell.....	1	Rossetti	1
Morris	15	Stevenson	2
Macaulay	1	Henry van Dyke.....	1
Sidney Lanier	1	Priece Collier	1
Edwin Arnold	1	Phillips Brooks.....	1

Quackenbos, though calling it a provincialism of the South and the East, says that it is as old as the English language, and that it is found in Chaucer and Mandeville. We have traced it from Malory to the present; when did it become provincial? That it is colloquial in some sections cannot be doubted. It is also archaic and for this reason is, as the table shows, used by poets and by such prose writers as are addicted to the use of archaic words. Then we come to standard phrases, such as "*Right Reverend*", "*Right Honorable*", and "*Right Worshipful*," recognized by the dictionaries. There still remain some prose authors of the modern period and of the present day not addicted to archaisms. It may be well to quote a few passages from well known authors of the various classes just mentioned. Tennyson (*Lancelot and Elaine*) says,

wit ye well, my ehild,
Right fain were I to learn this Knight were whole,
 Being our greatest.

Lowell (*The Vision of Sir Launfal*) says,

We sit in the warm shade and feel *right* well
 How the sap creeps up and the blossoms swell.

Browning (*The Ring and the Book*) says,

There's a sors, there's a *right* Virgilian dip.

Carlyle says (*Heroes and Hero Worship*), "A *right* valiant, true old race of men"; and "I suppose the *right* good fighter was oftenest also the *right* good forest-feller,—the *right* good

improver, discerner, doer, and worker in every kind." Christopher North (*Dryden on Chaucer*) says, "All this intricate omination comes forcibly out in the sequence of events; and is in itself, as you feel, at all events, *right* classical." Robert Louis Stevenson (*Kidnapped*) says, "I was *right* glad when Alan returned"; and "It was altogether a *right* pleasant sight to me."

The colloquial *right glad* and the literary *right glad* are not incompatible, but help to show that a word can have two values at one and the same time.

CVII

SAVE AND SAVING + NOMINATIVE CASE

All the conspirators *save* only *he*. (*Shakespeare*.)

None dare enter *save* Sir Robert and *he*. (*Kingsley*.)

The nominative case occurs quite frequently after *save* and *saving*. The authorities differ as to whether *save* in such cases is a preposition, a conjunction, or an old absolute participle. Baskervill and Sewell¹ say that *save* is sometimes used as a preposition with the nominative, and quote from Byron: "None, *save* thou and thine, I've sworn," etc. Mätzner² in commenting upon this same sentence from Byron, says that this passage shows how *save*, like *but*, "gives up the immediate relation to the following case." He treats *save* as a preposition. Nesfield³ parses *save* in the same manner, quoting from the King James Bible, Byron, and Shakespeare. Kellner⁴ says, "the particles *but* and *save* are sometimes used governing an oblique case, and sometimes with the nominative." In the latter construction he prefers to treat them

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 283.

² *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), II, 468.

³ *English Grammar Past and Present*, pp. 208, 467.

⁴ *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, pp. 130, 268.

rather as conjunctions than as prepositions. The Century Dictionary gives one example each from the Bible and Shakespeare but treats both *save* and *saving* as conjunctions. The New English Dictionary calls *save* a quasi-preposition + the nominative. It adds: "Apparently the normal construction." It quotes Chaucer, Lydgate, Tindale, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron, and others as using *save I*, *save he*, etc. This dictionary says that *saving* with the nominative is obsolete, quoting Tindale and Spenser. The latest cases of *saving* + nominative seen by the author are in the Bible and Edmund Spenser, but *save* + nominative is still alive in the language.

Save he is found in Chaucer. *Save* + nominative is found from Chaucer to the present. The following cases have been seen in the present course of reading:

Save I in Shakespeare and Byron.

Save thou in the Chester Plays.

Save he in Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Kingsley.

Saving he in King James Bible and in Spenser.

These phrases, while found to some extent in the literature, are archaïc and are not heard in the spoken English of the educated classes.

Byron in the *Isles of Greece* says,

Place me on Sunium's marbled steep,
Where nothing, *save* the waves and I,
May hear our mutual murmurs sweep.

C. B. Pallen (*Meaning of the Idylls of the King*) says, "None may pass into the spiritual house, wherein the Holy Grail abides, *save he* who is panoplied in the armor of faith."

Save + nominative is rarer than *but* + nominative. (See pp. 44 ff., above.)

CVIII

SCOUR = SEARCH, RANGE OVER

Camilla *scours* the plain. (*Pope*.)

From rear to van they *scour* about the plains. (*Keats*.)

Scour in the meaning of "search" is found in the literature and heard in the old states. The writer's interest in the locution was greatly increased by his being laughingly twitted in a university lecture-room for saying, "I *scoured* the whole library."

This use of *scour* is recognized by the Century Dictionary, quoting Pope and Franklin. Webster recognizes it, quoting the same passage from Pope. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes it, with a passage from Scott. The Standard, Worcester, and Oxford dictionaries recognize it, with quotations from the literature. T. L. K. Oliphant¹ cites a case in the literature of about 1575, from a book written by John Hooker, a noted antiquary, and the uncle of Richard Hooker.

The writer has collected the following passages:

Beaumont and Fletcher.....	1	Emerson	1
Milton	2	Thomas Campbell	1
Dryden	1	Thackeray	1
Pope	1	T. B. Aldrich.....	1
Dr. Johnson	1	George William Curtis.....	1
Franklin	1	D. G. Mitchell.....	1
Lamb	1	Bryant	1
Southey	1	Longfellow	1
Keats	1	Edwin Arnold	2

This use of *scour* was brought from England in the days of Milton, Dryden, Pope, Johnson, etc., and handed down in the old states. That accounts for its being used by Franklin, Bryant, Aldrich, and other Americans in their books and by educated people in conversation.

¹ *The New English*, I, 592.

This word has been confused with *scour* in the phrase “*scour* the floor.” It is probably the same word as that used by Macbeth when he cries, “*skirr* the country round,” and probably goes back to *discourriouris*, used by John Barbour, the Scottish poet, in the sense of “scouts”, “rangers,” and found in *Piers Plowman* and other old monuments as late as Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*.

Scour is a useful word, and also supported by high authority in literature. It sometimes means “search”, “ransack,” as in the phrase “*scour* the library.” But what other word would take its place in Pope’s “*Camilla scours* the plain”? No one would substitute “range over.” “Fly rapidly over” might convey the idea but would be too cumbersome.

Dr. Johnson, in a letter to Boswell, says, “If you will come to me, you must come very quickly; and even then I know not but we may *scour* the country together,” etc.

Milton (*Paradise Lost*, II, 633) says,

sometimes
He *scours* the right-hand coast, sometimes the left.

Again (*Paradise Lost*, VI, 529) :

others from the dawning hills
Looked round, and scouts each coast light-armèd *scour*,
Each quarter, to descry the distant foe.

Charles Lamb in his last essay says, “Half a hundred horsemen, with thrice the number of dogs, *scour* the country in pursuit of puss across three counties.” William Cullen Bryant in his translation of the *Iliad* (VI, 481) says,

Then valiant Menelaus took alive
Adrastus, whose two coursers, as they *scoured*
The plain in terror, struck against a branch
Of tamarisk, etc.

Is it at all strange that this locution survives in some of the old commonwealths? The writer has heard it all his life in one or more of them.

CIX

SETTLE AN ACCOUNT

In *Words and Their Uses*, Richard Grant White (pp. 191, 192) criticizes W. D. Howells for using the phrase “*settle* for the wine.” He then goes on to say in a tone of ridicule that this use of *settle* should be left to the “sable messengers that call the passengers ‘to step up to the cap’n’s office and settle.’” Hart and Genung in their popular textbooks have continued to set many earnest students and readers against this locution. According to these three, we cannot “settle an account”, “settle a bill,” etc.

These phrases are recognized by Webster’s International, the Century, Worcester, the Encyclopedic, and the New English dictionaries, the last named quoting Foote, Thackeray, and others.

Mrs. Gaskell in *Cranford*¹ says, “I went over from Drumble once a quarter at least, to *settle the accounts*, and see after the necessary business letters.”

Here we have three verbalists and professors of rhetoric against the phrase; five dictionaries and four reputable authors for it.

Polite colloquial usage favors it considerably.

CX

SICK AND SICKNESS

These words have had a peculiar history. After they had been used by all classes for centuries, they were ostracized from good society in England and in parts of the United States, so that now they need valiant defenders.

¹ Chapter XV.

T. L. K. Oliphant,¹ the noted scholar, stigmatized *sick* in 1886, saying, "is now confined to the sea and to Americans." Few scholars, however, attack the word; most of them use it in their books.

Richard Grant White,² in 1867, defended the word stoutly. He says: "*Sick* and *Ill* are two other words that have been perverted in general British usage. . . . They (British speakers and writers) sneer at us for not joining in the robbery and the imposition." White cites Arnold's *The Sick King in Bokhara* and a passage from that poem; also the locutions *sick bed* and *sick leave*. He might have added *sick bay* (U. S. Navy), *lovesick*, *homesick*, etc., and might have quoted practically every author of any note from Anglo-Saxon days to the moment he was writing. W. J. Rolfe, the noted Shakespearean scholar, in his edition of *Julius Caesar*,³ in commenting upon the word *sick* in Portia's question, "Is Brutus sick?" quotes from Richard Grant White: "For *sick*, the correct English adjective to express all degrees of suffering from disease, and which is universally used in the Bible and by Shakespeare, the Englishman of Great Britain has poorly substituted the adverb *ill*." Rolfe, in approving the opinion of White, differs with many educated people in his native New England. (It may be added here that the *literature* of New England is full of examples of this use of *sick*; see below.)

The Standard Dictionary, after defining *sick* as "affected with disease, ill, ailing," says, "the prevailing use in the United States and formerly in England." Webster in 1913 says, "affected with disease," etc., and adds, "In Great Britain usage now tends to confine *sick* to the sense of 'nauseated.'" The Century Dictionary is on the same side, and quotes passages from the *Merlin*, Latimer, Shakespeare, the King James

¹ *The New English*, II, 26.

² *Words and Their Uses*, pp. 196, 197.

³ See notes to his *Julius Caesar*, old edition, p. 149.

Bible, Pope, and Tennyson. The Century goes on to say, "There has been some tendency in England to confine *sick* to the distinctive sense of "nauseated," but in America the word has continued to have its original breadth of meaning, as found in the Bible and in Shakespeare." The Encyclopedic Dictionary is on the same side and quotes a passage from Pope. Worcester says, "Afflicted with disease; ill in health; sickly; affected with nausea," this last being one of the meanings, not the only meaning. The New English Dictionary says, "Now chiefly literary and U. S." This does not tally with Oliphant's statement, "Confined to the sea and to Americans." The New English Dictionary, however, recognizes the literary standing of the word which the present section aims to prove, incidentally showing that the expulsion of *sick* from polite society in England and in parts of America is utterly unwarranted: literary standing gives social standing to a word.

The word *sick* in its wide meaning is as old as the language. It is very common in Anglo-Saxon; comes down through Chaucer and Malory to modern English. As seen already, it is familiar to every reader of Shakespeare and of Bible English. From the days of James I to the present it has been one of the most frequent words in both colloquial and literary English. The recent objection to it is absolutely unaccountable and absolutely unreasonable—linguistic squeamishness.

The writer became physically exhausted from recording the passages in which *sick* was used; the following figures are but a fraction of the number that might have been noted. For instance, Cruden in his concordance to the Bible gives about seventy-five cases of *sick*; it is almost certain that there are several hundred. In Shakespeare the figures in the table below might be immensely increased. In Jeremy Taylor's chapters on sickness and death, the words *sick* and *sickness* occur about fifty times in a few pages. In the Prayer Book the writer

counted forty-two in a few short readings and could have run the number up many-fold.¹

The following figures are only partial:

Malory	20	Dr. Johnson	43
Latimer	8	Boswell	6
Bible	75	Gibbon	2
John Bale	1	Burke	2
Shakespeare	63	Goldsmith	2
Thomas Nash	5	Thomas Warton	1
Thomas Fuller	1	Cowper	6
Ben Jonson.....	1	Blake	1
Sidney	1	Paley	1
Thomas Sackville	3	Lamb	21
William Drummond	1	Wordsworth	7
Bacon	7	Byron	1
Massinger	3	Scott	5
John Donne	4	Freneau	4
Sir Thos. Browne.....	5	Keats	8
Rolls House MSS.....	3	Jane Austen	1
Two Noble Kinsmen.....	3	Mrs. Anna Jameson.....	1
John Webster	9	Poe	1
Marlowe	3	Hallam	1
Prayer Book ¹	42	Hawthorne	9
Bunyan	1	Pollok	3
Clarendon	1	Keble	5
Milton	1	Kingsley	5
Jeremy Taylor ²	76	Matthew Arnold	9
Robert Herrick.....	2	Carlyle	5
Defoe	1	Dean Trench	7
Dryden	3	Froude	14
John Evelyn	1	Dickens	2
Richard Baxter	4	F. W. Faber.....	1
Addison	5	Mrs. Gaskell	2
Steele	4	Walt Whitman	1
Bishop Burnet	5	Lowell	1
Swift	3	Dean Stanley	4
Prior	7	Morris	22
Pope	1	Motley	5

¹The writer records cases seen in reading; he does not look for a word.

²These figures could be increased *ad infinitum* by further reading in these treasures of good English.

Bryant	2	Frederic Harrison.....	2
Macaulay	10	Katharine Lee Bates.....	1
Cooper	1	F. T. Palgrave.....	2
Holmes	11	Thomas Hood	1
Lanier	2	George Eliot	7
Bret Harte	7	W. E. Henley.....	1
Dean Alford	1	Mrs. H. Ward.....	8
D. G. Rossetti.....	3	Brander Matthews	3
R. H. Stoddard.....	1	Phillips Brooks	3
D. G. Mitchell.....	8	Swinburne	4
A. H. Clough.....	4	Freeman	13
Mrs. Browning	1	Stopford Brooke	1
Robert Browning	11	G. K. Chesterton.....	2
Tennyson	41	Henry van Dyke.....	2
J. K. Hosmer.....	1	Edwin Arnold	6
T. N. Page.....	3	Stevenson	17

Here we have 102 authorities and about 700 passages.

The burden of proof is upon the opposition. By all the lexicographers and all through the literature, "nauseated," "inclined to vomit," is only one meaning of the word. Those who call this a nautical term or an Americanism must show when the word was declared unconstitutional by the supreme tribunal, the great authors.

The word "ill" is very rare in literature. It seems strange that a word used so very frequently in polite colloquial English in England and in parts of America should be so rare in the literature; but it goes to prove that affectations and "fads" are so unnatural that serious writers will not tolerate them. A man who has seen *sick* and *sickness* in all the great authors, heard it in the public reading of the Bible from his childhood, read it in his Prayer Book, and heard it in a hundred other solemn places, is not likely to drop it when he enters authorship. Though avoided by many educated people of New England, there is little doubt that nine-tenths of the best authors of that section use the word in its broad meaning.

Are we ever consistent in our prejudices against words and phrases? If *sick* is the wrong word for polite colloquial and

platform English, is it not wrong in more solemn places? And yet who in either England or New England would change *sick* to *ill* in the standard Bible? "Lazarus is *ill*"; "I was *ill* and in prison and ye visited me." Who would advocate such changes? So in the Prayer Book: "Visitation of the *ill*"; prayer for an *ill* person: prayer for an *ill* child—who would suggest these changes? Or take the marriage ceremony: "in *illness* and in health, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer." But we shall not carry our *reductio ad absurdum* any farther. Suffice to say that the word *sick* in its wide sense permeates the whole literature from Cadmon to Kipling.

This is one of the few matters in which this writer can agree with White. On one point White, however, is in error: he says, "Almost all British speakers and writers limit the meaning of *sick* to the expression of qualmishness, sickness at the stomach," etc. . . . As to the writers he is certainly mistaken, as has been shown in the foregoing paragraphs and in the table of statistics.

As already indicated, the enemies of *sick* do not agree. Oliphant says, "Confined to the sea and to Americans"; the New English Dictionary, "Now chiefly literary and U. S." Both agree that *sick* is an Americanism, but as to the rest they differ widely. One says that it is used only at sea; the other, that it is used in literature.

As the editors of some of the great dictionaries say that in England *sick* is confined to nausea, we will quote some passages from recent literature to refute their statements. Matthew Arnold in his *Pagan and Christian Religious Sentiment* has the passage: "of light-hearted people, like Gorgo and Praxinoë, whose moral nature is much of the same calibre as that of Phillina in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, people who seem never made to be serious, never made to be *sick* or sorry. And, if they happen to be *sick* or sorry, what will they do then? . . . Phillina, within the enchanted bounds of Goethe's novel, Gorgo and Praxinoë, within the enchanted bounds of

Theocritus's poem, never will be *sick* and sorry, never can be *sick* and sorry. The ideal, cheerful, sensuous pagan life is not *sick* or sorry." Try either "ill" or "nauseated" in that passage.

Matthew Arnold by himself ought to be sufficient. Francis T. Palgrave is recent; let us quote him next: in his *Litany* we read,

In the blindness of youth,
In *sickness* and health,
In the time of trial,
In the time of wealth,

Macaulay says, "It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a *sick* parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians." Lowell says, "If he were *sick* and you visited him, if he had met with a misfortune . . . it was all one," etc. Motley says, "This scene of honest pathos terminated, the necessary measures for distributing the food and for relieving the *sick* were taken by the magistracy." Ruskin says, "They (doctors), on the whole, desire to cure the *sick*," etc. Froude says, "Light in ballast and short of water, with half his men disabled by *sickness*, Howard was unable to pursue. . . . Of her crew of 190, ninety were *sick* on shore." Were these seamen all nauseated?

It would be impossible to quote a hundredth part of the passages teeming with *sick* and *sickness*.

CXI

THE SINGULAR ADJECTIVE AS A SUBSTANTIVE

So am I as the *rich*, whose blessèd key
Can bring him to his sweet up-lockèd treasure.

(*Shakespeare*: Sonnet 52.)

Three gifts the *dying* left me.

(*Mrs. Browning*: Sonnet to memory of H. S. Boyd.)

The use of the singular adjective as a substantive is familiar to students of Anglo-Saxon and of German but has become rare in modern English. It continued through Middle English, especially in poetry, but almost disappeared in the Tudor period. The Bible translators, however, used it pretty freely and it is found quite frequently in the Prayer Book Psalter. Of recent writers William Cullen Bryant is the only one, as far as the writer knows, to use it often.

The writer has recorded the following cases:

King James Bible.....	36	Bryant	21
Prayer Book ¹	17	Shelley	1
Shakespeare	2	Carlyle	3
Jeremy Taylor	2	Phoebe Cary.....	3
Dryden	2	Alice Cary	2
Southey	1	London Times	1
Poe ²	5	George Eliot	1
Mrs. Browning	1	Emerson	4
Robert Browning	1	Bayard Taylor	4
Tennyson	4	Longfellow	1
Hallam	1	Stephen Phillips	1

Stephen Phillips in *Orestes* says,

Lo! the *dead*

Cries out before me in the underworld.

The advanced student will enjoy Kellner's treatment of this old Germanic construction, now almost extinct in English.³

¹ Very numerous in the *Psalter*.

² All in his prose.

³ See his *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, §§ 238-241.

The writer was interested to see this old construction in a recent issue of the London *Times*. It is not likely that we shall see it revived to any great extent, but it is well to bring it to the attention of students and readers who have seen it in books but did not understand it.

The dropping of this adjective is one of the numerous changes in English due to the loss of inflections. The German can still use it because its article and its adjective are inflected; in English, *the dead* is usually understood as a plural, but in earlier English the inflections showed the number.

It should be said that, like other archaisms, this construction will be used chiefly by the poets; and this the table indicates.

Bryant uses it very often :

'Twas there he smote Eëtion, yet forebore
To make his arms a spoil; he dared not that,
But burned *the dead* with his bright armor on.

Give place to me, and let the mules pass on,
And ye may weep your fill, when once *the dead*
Is laid within the palace. (*Iliad.*)

Dryden's passage is familiar to all :

None but *the brave* deserves *the fair*.

Carlyle in *Sartor Resartus* says, "O, the vast, gloomy solitary Golgotha, and Mill of Death! Why *was* the *Living* banished thither companionless, conscious?" "Why seek ye *the living* among the dead?" is a great sentence which may have influenced Carlyle. And how could that sentence be written in our present English without marring its cadence and beauty?

The most recent case of singular adjective as substantive that the writer has seen in standard prose is in *Adam Bede*: "performing the initial duties to her *dead* with the awe and exactitude that belong to religious rites."

Is not this a loss to the language? We see it sporadically in writers of the present day.

CXII

SIT OR SET

1

Do clothes *sit* or *set*? Among the masses, including those engaged in fitting clothes for either sex, *set* is practically universal. Even with the better educated classes *set* is very common. A. S. Hill¹ says, "Though *set* is common, at least colloquially, . . . *sit* is preferable: a garment *sits* well or ill." The dictionaries are all on the side of *sits*. The Encyclopedic Dictionary quotes a passage from Shakespeare; the Century quotes Shakespeare and George Eliot; the New English Dictionary quotes authors of various periods.

The present writer has recorded the following passages among others: Chancer says,

But Lord! the perrie (=jewelry) and the richesse
I saugh *sitting* on this goddessse.

In *Gawaine and the Green Knight*, a knight's clothes "*sit* on him semly (=seemly)." Scott says, "To make the jacket *sit* yet more close to the body," etc. Poe says, "coats and pantaloons of black or brown, made to *sit* comfortably, with white cravats," etc. In Bret Harte we find "a hat *sat*." In Dickens "Mr. Trabb's (the tailor's) local work would have *sat* more gracefully." George Eliot says, "a woman whose skirt *sat* well."

Set is found occasionally in literature; the only cases seen in this course of reading are in Dickens's *Tale of Two Cities* and a letter of John Adams to Jefferson.

Though the words under discussion are rare in literature for obvious reasons, a few more passages are available. Bret Harte in his *John Burns* says,

He wore a broad-brimmed, bell-crowned hat,
White as the locks on which it *sat*.

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 148, 149.

Addison says, "our manners *sit* more loose upon us." Shakespeare says, "where *sits* the wind?" Professor Whitney speaks of a host of "new words on which their old apparatus of inflection *sat* strangely." Overwhelming literary usage is in favor of *sit*; colloquial usage is in favor of *set*, except in some very careful circles.

All tailors and clothiers probably say *set*: "Your coat *sets* well"; but the standard authors and great books say *sit*.

2

Do hens sit or set? This is a burning question in the school-room. The student hears *setting hen* all around him in most parts of the English world, and finds it hard to believe that it has little or no standing in literature.

A distinguished authority for *setting hen* is the eminent philologist George P. Marsh, one of the pioneers of English studies in America. In his *Lectures on the English Language* he uses this locution, much to the surprise of Professor Lounsbury, who cannot understand how such an error could have slipped into such a man's vocabulary.

The dictionaries and the grammars are nearly all in favor of the *sitting fowl*. Several of them quote from the Bible (*Jcr.* 17, 11), "As the partridge *sitteth* on eggs and hatcheth them," etc. Thomas More says, "hens do not *sit* and hatch them." Tennyson (*Balin and Balan*) says,

The white swan-mother, *sitting*, when she hears
A strange knee rustle thro' her secret reeds.

George W. Cable says, "The . . . wren sung to his *sitting* wife." The word is not common in the literature.

One of our school textbooks argues for the *setting hen* on the ground of popular usage. Would not this argument apply to clothes also? If "popular talk" is to be our guide, we shall have confusion worse confounded.

A fact worth mentioning in this connection is that in the Anglo-Saxon period *sit* (*sittan*) meant sit, stay, remain, continue, reside: "they *sat* on their knees" would be good Anglo-Saxon; also "the soldiers *sat* around the city"; *i.e.*, besieged it.

CXIII

THE SPLIT INFINITIVE

Shall an adverb ever be put between *to* and the other part of the infinitive? Is it permissible to say "to *rapidly* run," "to *diligently* study"? This is a "burning question" and one on which verbalists differ. Let us quote some on each side.

Dean Alford,¹ in 1864, said, "surely this is a practice entirely unknown to English speakers and writers." At this very moment Dean Alford could have found the split infinitive in the writings of Dickens, Matthew Arnold, Mrs. Gaskell, Browning, George Eliot, of his own day; Burns, Byron, Coleridge, Goldsmith, and others of earlier periods. The Rev. W. W. Skeat,² an eminent scholar of our day, calls it "the barbarous practice." Five English professors of Yale,³ in a recent chapter on usage, warn against it but say that it is used by a great many careful writers. Genung in his school Rhetoric⁴ calls it "a vulgarism"; condemns it in his *Practical Rhetoric*,⁴ but is more tolerant in his most recent work⁴ on rhetoric. A. S. Hill⁵ (1902) says that usage is divided, but that the weight of really good authority is in favor of not splitting the infinitive. This is true; the split infinitive is very rare as compared with the other. Quackenbos says, "not only

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 188.

² See his edition of the *House of Fame*, p. 112.

³ *English Composition in Theory and Practice*, by Canby and Others, p. 133.

⁴ *Outlines*, p. 72; *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 116; *Working Principles of Rhetoric*, p. 230.

⁵ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 292-295.

esthetically ugly but also an offense against philology." These statements sound plausible but cannot be proved.

In 1893, this locution found a sturdy advocate in Dr. Fitzedward Hall,¹ who defended it stoutly, though candidly admitting that he did not use it. (Does a scholar have to use all the locutions that he defends?) Baskervill and Sewell² say, "becoming more and more common among good writers." They quote "to *rightly* connect" and "to *first imperfectly* conceive such an idea" from Herbert Spencer; and "to *clearly* understand" from Ruskin. They also quote several cases of the passive form, but these seem to have escaped criticism. Carpenter³ says (1898), "Within the last twenty or thirty years the usage known as the 'split infinitive' . . . has come to be widely used in colloquial and literary English. . . . This usage has been violently attacked by rhetoricians as a vulgarism; it is, however, used without hesitation by many writers of repute. In some cases it has the distinct advantage of bringing an adverb into an emphatic position; *e.g.*, 'I wish to *thoroughly* understand this matter.' In others it is intolerably awkward." Herriek and Damon,⁴ in their *Rhetoric*, say, "It is not really an error in grammar and is to be objected to only when it produces clumsiness." Professor George P. Krapp⁵ argues that there is no logical objection to putting the adverb between the parts of the infinitive, and says further that no one ever objects to dividing the infinitive in -ing; *e.g.*, "His plan for *heavily* taxing the people." Krapp adds, "the 'split infinitive' is not only a natural, but often an admirable, form of expression." Professor O. F. Emerson⁶ says, "A good example of a syntactical combination even now establishing itself is the adverb between *to* and the infinitive."

¹ See *American Journal of Philology*, III, 17 ff., and *Nation*, vol. 56, p. 274.

² *English Grammar*, pp. 323, 324.

³ *Principles of English Grammar*, pp. 192, 193.

⁴ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 149.

⁵ *Modern English*, pp. 298-300.

⁶ *History of the English Language*, p. 276.

Jespersen¹ says that this construction, which he refuses to call the split infinitive, contributes decidedly to clearness, and quotes from standard authors two sentences that, in his opinion, would be much improved by putting the adverb between the *to* and the infinitive. He then quotes from Carlyle a sentence involving a split infinitive, a sentence which he recommends as very good but which, in the writer's opinion, is one of the ugliest sentences in our literature. The writer will add that he has seen only one split infinitive in Carlyle besides the one quoted by Jespersen.

The most ardent defender of the split infinitive is Professor Lounsbury,² who, it would seem, never uses one. He defends it very ardently in a long chapter. He tells us how Andrew Lang, the late lamented *littérateur*, praised the English government for standing up vigorously against a split infinitive in drawing a treaty with us Americans, who *will* butcher the English language. Then he proves conclusively that *to* + the infinitive was originally a corruption, while the insertion of the adverb cannot so easily be proved to be a corruption. He then takes up the charge that it is an innovation. He quotes Dr. Fitzedward Hall as proving, about twenty years ago, that this locution dates from the fourteenth century. Among the authors cited by Dr. Hall, Professor Lounsbury names:

Wycliffe	Southey
Pecock	Coleridge
Fortescue	Lamb
Tyndale	Wordsworth
Lord Berners	De Quincey
Thomas Browne	Charles Reade
Pepys	Macaulay
Bentley	Ruskin
Defoe	Herbert Spencer
Dr. Johnson	Leslie Stephen
Burke	

¹ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, pp. 208, 209.

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, pp. 240-268.

Some of these use it very rarely, says Lounsbury. To the list quoted from Hall, Lounsbury adds the following:

John Donne	Newman
Fanny Burney	Carlyle
Goldsmith	George Eliot
Franklin	Matthew Arnold
Burns	Browning
Byron	Holmes
Keats	Lowell

Here are 35 reputable authors from Wycliffe to Lowell; how can the locution be called either a vulgarism or an innovation?

The writer has seen the following cases:

Wycliffe	2	J. R. Green.....	1
Pecock	4	Bret Harte	1
Sir Thomas Browne.....	1	Jowett	1
Burns	1	John Fiske	1
Byron	2	T. B. Aldrich.....	3
Coleridge	1	Stopford Brooke	2
Freneau	1	G. K. Chesterton.....	1
Irving	1	G. W. Cable.....	1
Mrs. Gaskell	1	W. E. Henley.....	1
George Eliot.....	1	H. W. Mabie.....	4
Dickens	1	Katharine Lee Bates.....	1
Matthew Arnold	3	Ella W. Wilcox.....	1
Browning	23	Mrs. H. Ward.....	1
Macaulay	1	J. K. Hosmer.....	1
Ruskin	1	Henry Drummond.....	2
Herbert Spencer.....	5	Saintsbury	1
Carlyle	1	W. D. Whitney.....	1

Here we have about 20 authors not in the lists above, giving a total of about 55 using the split infinitive occasionally.

The split infinitive spread considerably in the nineteenth century, but not among the standard authors; they use it very sparingly. The statement of Baskervill and Sewell, "It is becoming more and more common among good writers," must be taken cautiously. One has to *search* the great literature to find the split infinitive; it crops up frequently in scientific

journals, daily papers, reports of mercantile societies, and such places. It is used pretty frequently by well educated men not especially careful of their English.

Numerically, Browning is the greatest offender. Lounsbury cites passages of Browning's from 1835 on. The writer has recorded twenty-three cases, mostly from *The Ring and the Book*.

Browning not only uses more split infinitives than any other ten great authors combined but leads them all in the number of words put between *to* and the infinitive:

To quietly next day at crow of cock
Cut my own throat too. (*The Ring and the Book*.)

Shall we, then, adopt and push this locution? Not necessarily. The other form is vastly stronger in the literature and in polite speech. It has no enemies, raises no objections, excites no criticism. But we are interested to know from the facts collected that the use of a split infinitive does not necessarily put us among illiterates, ignoramuses, and violators of English undefiled, as some have long been saying.

It has been said above that the split infinitive is rare. In a wide course of reading covering a period of five hundred years, the author has seen only seventy-two cases, while he has seen the regular infinitive thousands of times. Though very rare in standard literature, it is spreading in the daily and weekly papers, and in the colloquial English of the intelligent classes.

While a good many reputable authors use the split infinitive, they use it rarely. In hundreds of pages of Matthew Arnold, only three cases were found: in Cable's *Dr. Sevier*, one case; in thousands of pages of George Eliot, one case. In a short article in the *Popular Science Monthly*, on the other hand, six or eight cases were seen.

If we deduct Browning's figures, we have about forty-nine split infinitives in over 75,000 pages of English and American literature. This does not indicate much spreading among emi-

ment writers, though this class may adopt it in this century.

We must all admit, then, that the split infinitive is neither an innovation nor a vulgarism, but a rarity in pure literature; that it is very clear and very convenient, and has a right to a trial in the language.

A good scholar tells us the split infinitive is very common in Swedish literature.

Matthew Arnold says,

The will to *neither* strive nor cry,
The power to feel with other, give!

“He is not satisfied, unless he can tell us, all in one sentence, and without permitting himself to *actually* mention the name, that,” etc.¹ Herbert Spencer² says, “To *so* present ideas that they may be apprehended with the least possible mental effort,” etc.; also, “the events should be stated in such sequence that the mind may not have to go backwards and forwards in order to *rightly* connect them”; and “to an active mind it may be easier to bear along all the qualifications of an idea and at once *rightly* form it when named, than to *first imperfectly* conceive such idea and then carry back to it, one by one, the details and limitations afterwards mentioned.” Browning, the high priest of the split infinitive, says (*The Ring and the Book*),

To *somehow* make a shift and scramble through
The world's mud.

Send five souls more to *just* precede his own.

survives, we'll hope,
To *somewhat* purify her putrid soul
By full confession.

Without help, make shift to *even* speak, you see.

George Eliot³ says, “It was in the nature of a stroke to *partly* take away the use of a man's limbs and throw him on the parish.”

¹ Essay On Translating Homer.

² Philosophy of Style.

³ Silas Marner.

CXIV

SPLITTING PARTICLES

A man doesn't think much *of*, nor care much *for*, a woman outside of his household, unless, *etc.* (*Oliver Wendell Holmes.*)

The use of the prepositions as seen in the sentence above is called "the splitting of particles." It is condemned by most writers on style but is found all through the literature. Dr. Hugh Blair in his *Rhetoric*¹ says, "What is called splitting of particles, or separating a preposition from the noun which it governs, is always to be avoided. As if I should say, 'Though virtue borrows no assistance *from*, yet it may often be accompanied *by*, the advantages of fortune.' In such instances, we feel a sort of pain, from the revulsion, or violent separation of two things, which, by their nature, should be closely united. We are put to a stand in thought; being obliged to rest for a little on the preposition by itself, which, at the same time, carries no significancy, till it is joined to its proper substantive noun." That Blair in this same book violates his own canon at least four times the table will prove. Dean Alford condemned this construction rather mildly. In his *Queen's English*² he says, "in sentences where several forms of speech converge, so to speak, on one term, that term is better expressed or indicated after each of them, than reserved to be expressed or indicated once only at the end of all."

Genung³ is very lenient toward this construction. He says, "is to be used only with great caution, and with no long delay after the particle." He himself uses it in his college textbooks pretty frequently. In his most recent textbook, he treats it as a "suspect" under the head of "ellipses." The

¹ P. 124.

² Pp. 140, 141.

³ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 159 (2); *Working Principles of Rhetoric*, p. 302 (3).

textbook by the elder Hart, a distinguished rhetorical scholar of his day, and revised by his distinguished son, J. M. Hart, takes the same view as Dr. Blair.

The writer has recorded the following cases:

Latimer	1	Bulwer	2
Sir Thomas Browne.....	2	Douglas Jerrold.....	1
Jeremy Taylor.....	4	Lounsbury	3
Defoe	2	Chesterton	5
Burnet	1	Mrs. H. Ward.....	2
Dr. Blair	4	G. W. Cable.....	3
Thomas Paine	1	Genung	15
Burke	2	Stopford Brooke	12
Christopher North	1	Price Collier	10
Sir William Hamilton.....	13	Saintsbury	4
Gibbon	4	Pater	2
Shelley	1	Browning	1
Coleridge	32	Dean Trench	11
Hazlitt	5	George P. Marsh.....	1
Lamb	4	Fitzedward Hall	1
Jefferson	3	Professor John Earle.....	5
Scott	3	Emerson	1
Hallam	2	Monckton Milnes	1
Dickens	1	John Lubbock	1
Holmes	3	W. D. Whitney.....	12
Poe	2	William Minto	3
Prescott	1	Matthew Arnold.....	3
Motley	2	Froude	6
Cooper	3	H. W. Mabie	15
Ruskin	5	Huxley	5
Hare	1	Churton Collins	2
Stanley	3	Sidney Lee	1
Macaulay	3	Walter Bagehot	2
Thackeray	2	T. N. Page.....	2
Milman	4	Sir Leslie Stephen	1
Kingsley	1	Katharine Lee Bates.....	1

Here are 62 reputable writers in nearly 250 passages, covering a period of 350 years. On the list stand Blair, Fitzedward Hall, Dean Trench, George P. Marsh, Minto, Whitney, Lounsbury, Earle, and other eminent students of style and of

language; Coleridge, Froude, Ruskin, Macaulay, and other famous prose stylists.

Illustrative passages may be added. Emerson in *The Over-Soul* says, "It calls the light its own, and feels that the grass grows and the stone falls by a law inferior *to*, and dependent *on*, its nature." Froude in his *Lives of the Saints* says, "certain progressive organizing laws in which the fretful lives of each of us are gathered *into* and subordinated *in* some larger unity." Motley (*Dutch Republic*) says, "The Walloons were the first to rebel *against* and the first to reconcile themselves *with* papal Rome." Prescott in his *Miscellanies* says, "a principal incentive *to*, as they were the recompense *of*, exertion." Ruskin in *Sesame and Lilies* uses a little different form of this "error": "You may measure your dominion by multitudes, better than by miles; and count degrees of love-latitude, not *from*, but *to*, a wonderfully warm and infinite equator"; and, "altars built, not *to*, but *by* an Unknown God." Macaulay uses various forms of ellipsis and splitting of particles: "The line of demarcation *was* not, and perhaps *could not be*, drawn with precision"; also, "At some other important stations *on* or *near* the coast"; and, "Those Whigs who stood by the new dynasty so manfully with purse and sword did so on principles independent *of*, and indeed almost incompatible *with*, the sentiment of devoted loyalty."

The writers on usage and propriety are much stricter than the great authors in this matter as in others.

It may be added that various forms of ellipsis are common in the literature; this particular form is more attacked than the others. It certainly detracts from the beauty of a sentence, though it conduces to rapidity. We may say, also, that it is not used much by the great stylists.

These elliptical sentences attacked by Blair, Alford, and others have been spreading in English for many centuries; they are all due to the desire for brevity. They could not spread, however, as long as English was a highly inflected

language. For instance, if the prepositions in the foregoing sentences required different cases, the ellipsis would be impossible. The split constructions, in other words, followed upon the decay of inflections in the Middle English period.

CXV

SUCH AS AN ADVERB

Quackenbos¹ and Genung² says that *such* should not be used for *so*; as "*such* a beautiful vine." That is, we must say "*so* beautiful a vine." Is this used much either in literature or in polite society? "*I never saw weather so severe*" is very little used; "*I never saw such severe weather*" is very common in conversation and is found in literature.

Webster is against the view taken by the textbooks referred to. This dictionary uses the phrase "*such* a terrible storm" and quotes "*such* excellent order" from Daniel Defoe. The Century Dictionary says that *such* in this locution assumes a quasi-adverbial appearance but is really an adjective. The Century quotes a passage from Shakespeare. Baskervill and Sewell³ treat this *such* as an adverb equivalent to *so*, and quote "*such* universal popularity," from Irving; "*such* a glittering appearance," from Hawthorne; and "*such* commanding power," from Lecky. They go on to say that this use of *such* is found in the following authors, among others: Grote, Emerson, Thackeray, Motley, White. The Encyclopedic Dictionary recognizes this use and cites the phrase "*such* terrible weather."

While this use of *such* has considerable vogue in polite colloquial English, it seems to be avoided in writing. The only authors the writer can quote are Samuel Johnson, George

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, p. 245.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 329.

³ *English Grammar*, p. 186.

Saintsbury, and John Burroughs. Yet, as seen above, it has warm support in high quarters.

The Anglo-Saxon *such* (*surylce*) was often used as an adverbial conjunction, also with numerals in the sense of "about." Abbott¹ treats *such* in "such a man" and similar phrases as semi-adverbial; why should we hesitate to treat *such* as adverbial or quasi-adverbial in the phrases under discussion?

Dr. Johnson in a letter says, "condolences and consolations are *such* common and *such* useless things, that the omission of them is no great crime."

CXVI

SUCH A ONE AND SUCH AN ONE

Which is right, *such a one* or *such an one*? Let the literature help us to settle the question.

The writer has recorded the following:

1. SUCH A ONE

Interlude of Thersytes.....	3	Hume	1
Shakespeare	3	Shelley	1
King James Bible	4	Keats	1
Shakespeare and Fletcher.....	1	Lamb	4
Prayer Book	2	Bryant	1
Massinger	4	Cooper	1
Lyly	1	Holmes	1
Jeremy Taylor	2	Huxley	1
Congreve	2	Carlyle	2
Baxter	1	Fitzedward Hall	1
Addison	2	Tennyson	5
Pope	1	Browning	1
Steele	2	Richard Grant White.....	1
Bolingbroke	1	Kingsley	3
Burke	2	Jones Very	1
Goldsmith	1	Lowell	1

¹ *How to Parse*, p. 142.

Herbert Spencer	1	Lounsbury	1
Whitney	1	E. C. Stedman	1
Cable	2	H. W. Mabie	1

38 authorities; 65 cases.

2. SUCH AN ONE

Mandeville ¹	1	Tennyson	1
Bacon	1	Morris	3
King James Bible.....	10	Browning	10
Shakespeare	1	Lang	1
Addison	2	Swinburne	2
Robert South	1	Mabie	1
Pope	1	Freeman	1
Hume	1	D. G. Mitchell.....	3
Bishop Warburton	1	Dr. James Orr.....	1
Locke	1	Huxley	1
Jefferson	1	C. Geikie	1
Macaulay	1	Stevenson	2

24 authorities; 49 cases.

On both sides we find:

Shakespeare	Hume
King James Bible	Browning
Addison	Tennyson
Pope	Mabie

As seen from the tables, Browning uses the *an* ten times; *a*, once. In this, as in various matters, Browning's usage differs from that of his colleagues in literature.

Dean Alford says,² "It seems to me that we may now, in writing, use either. In common talk I should always naturally say *such a one*, not *such an one*; which would sound formal and stilted."

It may be added that the phrase started out as *such one*, from Middle English *swilk ān*. This becomes *such one* in Chaucer, Wycliffe, and Malory. The earliest case of *such a one* seen by the writer is *sicke a won* in the ballad of *Johnnie*

¹ Borrowed from T. L. K. Oliphant.

² *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 49.

Armstrong, probably written down between the time of Malory and that of Shakespeare. Oliphant¹ records *such an one* in *Mandeville*, which puts that ahead of *such a one*, as would be expected, *an* being the original form of the article. *Such one* lasted through the days of Coverdale, the Geneva Bible, and the sermons of Latimer, after the other locution had started out.

The tendency in polite speech is decidedly in favor of *such a one*. This has in its favor the same economy of utterance that led to the evolution of *a* from *an* before consonants: why should we say *such an one* any more than "an one-sided affair", "an one-armed man," etc.? The word *one* begins with a *w* in pronunciation and the *n* would naturally drop off the article. *Such an one* is rather puristic; it is opposed to the principle of economy and to the tendency of the language. In the nineteenth century, *such a one* outstripped *such an one* in literature, both in quantity and in quality, though the "an" form has considerable vitality.

Addison in the *Spectator* says, "and every now and then inquires how *such an one's* wife, or mother, or son, or father do, whom he does not see at church"; "one of Sir Roger's servants would ride up to his master full speed, and whisper to him that the master of the house was against *such a one* in the last election." Burke, as far as noted, uses *a*: "The colleagues . . . were obliged to ask, 'Sir, your name?'—'Sir, you have the advantage of me.'—'Mr. *Such-a-One*'—'I beg a thousand pardons.' " Again, in the same speech (*Conciliation*): "When *such a one* is disarmed, he is wholly at the mercy of his superior." Tennyson seems to prefer *a* though he also uses the other:

To *such a one*

He promised more than ever king has given.

She wept her true eyes blind for *such a one*.

¹ *The New English*, I, 163.

Swinburne, as far as noted, uses *an*:

And lo, between the nightfall and the light,
He is not, and none knoweth of *such an one*.

* Shall *such an one* lend love or borrow?
Shall these be sorry for thy sorrow?

If we consider that the Bible is archaic in many respects and Browning fantastic in his grammar, we must conclude that *such a one* has overwhelming modern usage in its favor.

CXVII

THE SUPERLATIVE USED OF TWO

Shall the superlative be used of *two*? On this point the rhetorical scholars are very strict. A. S. Hill,¹ Genung,² and Herrick and Damon³ are all against it. The grammarians are less rigid. Bain⁴ says, "the rule is not strictly adhered to." He quotes one passage from Thackeray, and says, "Writers and speakers continually use the superlative in comparing two things." Whitney⁵ says, "both in ordinary talk and in literature, it is very common to speak of one of two things as being *the longest*, although to say *the longer* is more accurate and more approved." Carpenter⁶ says, "seems to be almost invariably due to carelessness, but it is so common, both in colloquial and literary English, and so natural, that it must usually be regarded as an innocent error." Baskervill and Sewell⁷ say, "The superlative degree of the adjective (or adverb) . . . is also frequently used in comparing only two things." They cite passages from Dr. Blair, Addison, Gold-

¹ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 262, 263.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 57.

³ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 151.

⁴ *Higher English Grammar*, p. 150.

⁵ *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 87.

⁶ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 178.

⁷ *English Grammar*, pp. 306, 307.

smith, Irving, Scott, Hawthorne, Thackeray, Ruskin, Emerson, and Mrs. Oliphant. Some of the sentences involve adverbs.

W. J. Rolfe, in his edition of the *Merchant of Venice*,¹ defends this use of the superlative as seen in Shakespeare, and says "it is good old English though condemned by most modern grammars." (Since Rolfe wrote this, the best grammars have defended the construction.)

Lounsbury² is a staunch defender of this superlative. He says, "Met with constantly in the best writers."

Add to the foregoing defenders of this locution the following authorities that use it:

Shakespeare	1	Chesterfield	1
I Henry VI.....	2	Thackeray	1
Dr. Johnson	2	William Minto	1

After a careful study of the superlative used of two, it appears that the three textbooks quoted are in a decided minority as compared with the authors and the greater grammarians.

Polite conversation teems with this locution; in fact, only the most careful confine themselves to the other. Indeed, it would seem that the comparative degree of adjectives is on the road to extinction except before *than*. Alexander Bain³ says that the comparative as in "the *larger* of the two" is a useless encumbrance in the language.

Boswell quotes Johnson as saying, "We must consider whether Homer was not the *greatest* poet, though Virgil may have produced the *finest* poem." They were comparing the two. Chesterfield says, "it is hard to say which of the two is the *most* mischievous weapon."

¹ Notes to that play, p. 137, note 7. old edition.

² *History of the English Language*, p. 252.

³ *Higher English Grammar*, p. 150.

CXVIII

SUPERLATIVES IRREGULARLY FORMED

Many grammars give us the idea that forms like *diligentest*, *honestest*, etc., are rather ungrammatical. Baskervill and Sewell,¹ however, show us by examples from literature "how literary English overrides any rule that could be given." Lounsbury, also, tells us that the *more* and *most* forms have predominated, not because the others are improper but because the forms in *more* and *most* are more euphonious. Take this very one just used: there are very eminent authors who would not hesitate to say "euphoniouiser" sometimes; and such a form would be perfectly grammatical, though not altogether pleasant to the ear. Carpenter² says, "The ear alone decides."

The writer watched the literature closely to see how many great authors use these forms.

First let us cite the authors quoted by Baskervill and Sewell in their grammar: From Thackeray they cite *handsomest*, *immensest*, *wonderfulest*; from Ruskin, *patientest*, *distantest*, *sorrowfulest*; from Carlyle, *beautifulst*, *mournfulest*, *honestest*, *admirablest*, *indisputablest*, *peaceablest*.

The writer has recorded the following:

Latimer, grievouser.

Shakespeare, weefullest.

Milton, accuratest, diligentest, exquisitest, powerfullest.

Keats, fancifullest and beautifullest.

Browning, portentousest and irreligiousst.

Carlyle, nakedest, savagest, honestest, solidest, wretchedest, activist, pitifuller, usefuller, incorruptiblest, etc.

Charles Lamb, learnedest, servilest, correctest, comfortablest.

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 109.

² *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 103.

G. W. Cable, lovingest.

Tennyson, secretest, absoluter.

It may be added that the comparison by *more* and *most* is due to French influence and came into English in the Middle English period. Writers like Browning, Carlyle, Milton, Latimer, Shakespeare, and Ruskin often revert, more or less unconsciously, to the older forms of expression; it is the small writers who are afraid to leave the beaten track of language.

Milton in *Areopagitica* says, "while the book is yet under the press, which not seldom happens to the best and *diligentest* writers"; "or the author lose his *accuratest* thoughts and send the book forth worse than he had made it"; "to gnaw out the choicest periods of *exquisitest* books." Tennyson in *The Poet* says,

With echoing feet he threaded
The *secretest* walks of fame.

Keats says in *Endymion*,

Or to tread breathless round the frothy main,
And gather up all *fancifullest* shells.

Say, *beautifullest*, shall I never think?

Browning (*The Ring and the Book*) says,

Thus it happed not, since thus he did the deed,
And proved himself thereby *portentousest*
Of cutthroats.

This is the man proves *irreligiousst*
Of all mankind, religion's parasite.

Any one who cares to risk these unephonious though grammatical forms has high authority for doing so.

CXIX

SUSPECT = SUPPOSE, IMAGINE

A good many people say *suspect* for "suppose", "imagine", "think." Some may do this in order to avoid *expect*, which is of course a vulgarity. But is *suspect* very much better than *expect*? Are those who use it not running from Scylla to Charybdis? The one vital difference between the two words is that *expect* in the meaning under discussion has no standing in literature, while *suspect* is used by a respectable number of the best authors and by a large number of educated men and scholars not strictly literary.

The writer has seen *suspect* in this sense in the following:

Dr. Johnson	1	Emerson	2
George Campbell	5	Holmes	3
Thomas Jefferson	3	Fitzedward Hall	4
Lamb	2	Bulwer	1
Milman	1	Sir Henry Taylor	1
Hallam	1	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	7
Browning	2	Freeman	1
Hawthorne	1	W. J. Rolfe	1
Lowell	20	H. N. Hudson	4
Kingsley	1	E. C. Stedman.....	4
Herbert Spencer	1	James Bryce	1
Macaulay	13	W. W. Skeat.....	2

The statistics given above and the pretty wide use of *suspect* in polite conversation indicate a need for this word or some other conveying the same shade of meaning. *Suspect*, however, as Webster says, usually has an unfavorable meaning; and it may be added that it will never be popular as long as it has this unpleasant connotation.

George Campbell says, "First, the word *mobile*, from which it is contracted, can scarcely be called English, and, I *suspect*, never had the sanction of the public voice"; and, "Some of these, I *suspect*, have as yet escaped the animadversion of

all our critics." Macaulay in his essay on Bacon says, "Such questions, we *suspect*, would have puzzled Simplicius and Isidore." Browning (*The Ring and the Book*) says,

Peter and John and Judas spent a day
In toil and travel through the country-side
On some sufficient business—I *suspect*,
Suppression of some Molinism i' the bud.

W. J. Rolfe in his comments on the *Merchant of Venice* says, "I *suspect* that it would never have occurred to the commentators," etc. Kingsley makes one of the leading characters in *Hereward* say, "He will soon be off to the Orkneys, I *suspect*, or to Sweyn in Denmark, after Vikings."

Of course "suppose", "think", "imagine", "dare say" are less open to attack than *suspect*; but we seem to need another word to convey our meaning. This explains also the provincial *expect*, *guess*, and *reckon*.

William James, the psychologist, uses *suspect* in his books; and he no doubt represents a large constituency of educated men and women not producing what is generally called literature.

CXX

SYMPATHY WITH, FOR, IN

The writer has often hesitated whether to say *sympathy with* or *sympathy for* a person. No doubt others have had the same experience.

1. AS TO PERSONS

Webster says that sympathy is usually followed by *for*; the Encyclopedic Dictionary says *with*. De Quincey¹ calls *sympathy for* a barbarism, an opinion which Genung¹ en-

¹For both statements of opinion, see Genung's *Rhetorical Analysis*, pp. 11, 12.

dorses. Genung is again possessed by the evil spirit of derivation.

The present writer has seen *sympathy for* a person in Burke, Chalmers, and the Standard Dictionary; *sympathy with* a person in De Quincey, Macaulay, Phillips Brooks, and the Century Dictionary. For instance, De Quincey (*On the Knocking at the Gate in "Macbeth"*) says, "What then must he (the poet) do? He must throw the interest on the murderer. Our sympathy must be *with* him," etc. Burke (Fox's East India Bill) says, "In order to awaken something of *sympathy for* the unfortunate natives." The Century Dictionary uses the phrase "to have *sympathy with* a person in his hopes, aspirations, or aims."

2. AS TO THINGS OR EMOTIONS

The writer has seen *sympathy with* in Cowper, Hallam, Hawthorne, and Professor John Earle; *sympathy in*, in Poe; *sympathy for*, in Hawthorne. For instance, Hawthorne (*Blithedale Romance*) says, "Priscilla's silent *sympathies with* his purposes." Poe in *The Poetic Principle* speaks of "our *sympathy in* the poet's enthusiasm." Hawthorne (*Marble Faun*), speaks of "the marble faces (which) . . . had no *sympathy for* his disappointment."

None of the phrases under discussion are very common in standard literature. The author of this volume will not venture to make an authoritative statement as to any one of them: the reader can easily see that, as far as the present course of study shows, there is some high authority for all the phrases under investigation.

.

CXXI

TALENTED

The adjective *talented* was condemned by Johnson, Coleridge, Landor, Trench, and Alford. Coleridge¹ in his *Table Talk* calls it "that vile and barbarous vocable," adding, "Most of these pieces of slang come from America." Upon which remark of the poet, his nephew² and literary executor comments: "They do." Dean Alford³ said, "about as bad as possible." Genung⁴ says, "in good usage, though the most careful writers avoid it." *Talented* is ridiculed by White in his *Words and Their Uses*.

T. L. K. Oliphant finds the word in 1627 in the writings of Archbishop Abbott.⁵ It is recognized by the Century, the Standard, Worcester, Webster's International, and the Encyclopedic dictionaries, the last two defending it in a note. The New English Dictionary recognizes it, quoting Lytton, Southey, Herschel, William Taylor, Pusey, and Whittier. Fitzedward Hall⁶ defended it stoutly. Herriek and Damon⁷ in their chapter on usage say, "In perfectly reputable use today." Jespersen⁸ puts it among adjectives in *-ed* along with *blue-eyed*, *goodnatured*, *renowned*, and *conceited*, all formed from nouns, by adding *-ed*.

The writer has seen the word twice in Dickens, once in Poe, and once in a book by Professor T. M. Parrott. No doubt many writers avoid the word on account of the opposition of men like those named in the opening paragraph of this section. It is used in polite society.

¹ See *Table Talk* under July 8, 1832.

² See note to foregoing reference.

³ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 109.

⁴ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 330.

⁵ See *The New English*, II, 80. For *entaled* in a poem of Oecleve, A.D., 1402, see *New English*, I, 208.

⁶ *Modern English*, pp. 70 ff.

⁷ *New Composition and Rhetoric*, p. 227.

⁸ *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 163.

The objection urged against *talented* is that *-cd* should not be added to a noun to form an adjective. This argument would be equally valid against *gifted* and *moneyed* and others which seem to be thoroughly established in the language. Mandeville, over five hundred years ago, has *now sworded* and *now daggered*, showing that adjectives were formed from nouns by adding *-cd* at the beginning of the modern English period. Adjectives have been formed from nouns by adding *-cd* in all periods of modern English; e.g., *diademcd*, *ribboncd*, *landcd*, *leisurcd*, *lettercd* and *unlettercd*, *widowcd*, *wingcd*, *bigoted*, *crabbed*. (Borrowed from Fitzedward Hall.) We speak of the "landcd gentry," the "unlettercd classes," the "widowcd pillow," a "crabbed person", "moneyed men"; why not say "a talented man"? So much for etymology.

As to its long use in the language: we have shown that it has been domesticated for almost three centuries. As to its convenience and usefulness there can be no doubt.

Some have objected to the use of *talent* in the metaphorical sense. This, however, is perfectly in accord with the genius of language, the transition from the physical to the psychical being exceedingly common: from *talent*, a sum of money, to *talent*, a mental endowment, is perfectly natural.

If numbers count, *talented* is certainly in good standing.

Dickens in *Pickwick* says, "It was in the evening, however, that the Peacock presented attractions which enabled the two friends to resist even the invitations of the *talented*, though prosily inclined, Mr. Pott"; and, "the following effusion, which we received while we were writing the commencement of this article from a *talented* fellow-townsmen and correspondent." The American dictionaries, while defending the word, do not quote from the literature. They might quote Poe: "so called from its *talented* inventor, my father."

CXXII

TENSE OF THE INFINITIVE

Esmond would have liked *to have kissed* her in her shroud. (*Thackeray*.)

The sentence given above is typical of a large number of sentences used in polite society as in literature. It is condemned by writers on usage from George Campbell to living textbook-makers.

Campbell¹ says: "When the infinitive is expressive of what is conceived to be either future in regard to the verb in the present, or contemporary, the infinitive ought to be in the present. . . . The same rule must be followed when the governing verb is in the preterite; for let it be observed, that it is the tense of the governing verb only that marks the absolute time; the tense of the verb governed marks solely its relative time with respect to the other. Thus I should say, 'I always intended *to write* to my father, though I have not yet done it.' " A "common error" treated of in the school books is putting *to have written* in the sentence quoted from Campbell. Of course the sentence from Thackeray at the head of this section is faulty if that canon be accepted.

Richard Grant White,² in 1880, condemned this construction, saying that it was very common even among good writers, but wrong in spite of all the authors that ever did use it or might use it. He cites two passages from Black's *Princess of Thule*; also passages from Heywood, Middleton, Shirley, Clarendon, and Buckle—three hundred years of error.

Quackenbos,³ A. S. Hill,⁴ and Genung,⁵ in their schoolbooks,

¹ *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Book II, chap. IV.

² *Every-day English*, pp. 477ff.

³ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, p. 235.

⁴ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 187-189.

⁵ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 63.

give the same rule that Campbell gave in 1776. Baskervill and Sewell¹ treat this locution under the head of "Lack of logical sequence in verbs," and quote faulty sentences from Defoe, Macaulay, De Quincey, Dean Church, and Irving. They say, however, that these phrases used to be in accord with the older idea of sentence unity, but that a change has been setting in recently.

Lounsbury² is far more careful in his statement. He says, "When the verb of the predicate is in the past tense, there has been constantly exhibited a disposition on the part of the language to resort to this (past) form of the infinitive. This practice goes back to the fourteenth century (quoting Chaucer). . . . Since that time it has been exceedingly common, and has in its favor the sanction of usage by the greatest English authors. Of late the language seems disposed to abandon its employment; at least it is condemned by many grammarians." With so conservative a statement as this before their eyes for over thirty years, are the rhetoric professors of America and the writers of schoolbooks not too violent in their condemnation of this construction?

The writer has noted the following violations of this rule:

Malory	4	Scott	4
King James Bible	1	Byron	1
Shakespeare	2	Coleridge	1
Marlowe	3	Lamb	5
Bacon	1	Dr. John Brown	1
Milton	2	Cooper	2
Congreve	1	Macaulay	2
Burnet	1	Poe	2
Addison	2	Jowett	2
Dr. Johnson	2	J. R. Seeley	1
Boswell	2	Holmes	1
Franklin	2	Dean Stanley	1
Thomas Warton	1	George William Curtis	1
Fielding	2	Thackeray	1

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 319.

² *History of the English Language*, pp. 445, 446.

Bulwer	2	H. W. Mabie	2
Kingsley	2	G. W. Cable	1
I. D'Israeli	1	G. K. Chesterton.....	3
Dickens	1	Brander Matthews.....	1
Froude	5		

The tables show about 40 authors, and many more might be cited.

By running carefully over the list above, the reader can judge whether the language is abandoning this construction or some writers on usage have made an unwarranted attack upon it. Personally, the writer does not prefer the misrelated infinitive, or whatever else we may call it, but is simply recording its status in the literature.

It certainly has a wide vogue in polite circles and among reputable speakers; *e.g.*, "I intended *to have written* before this time" would certainly pass muster in many a gathering of educated men not addicted to verbal criticism.

Addison in the *Spectator* says, "At the same time, he owned he should have been very glad *to have seen* the little boy"; "Milton's sentiments and ideas were so wonderfully sublime, that it would have been impossible for him *to have represented* them in their full strength and beauty, without having recourse to these foreign assistances." Dr. Johnson (*Rasselas*) says, "I am not a princess, but an unhappy stranger who intended soon *to have left* this country, in which I am now to be imprisoned forever." Lamb (Letters) says, "So far from being ashamed of that intimacy which was betwixt us, it is my boast that I was able for so many years *to have preserved* it entire"; and "Perhaps he wished *to have seen* the tomb of Nelson." James Anthony Froude uses this infinitive frequently; we will quote two passages: "The late Sir Eger-ton Brydges—a writer whose talents, though admitted, were never received as they merited *to have been* by the world"; "It would have been enough *to have coloured* him in and out alike in the steady hues of selfishness."

CXXIII

THAN AS A QUASI-PREPOSITION

Can *than* be a preposition? One of the best recent grammarians of England¹ so parses it in some places, and another² seems inclined to call it "a quasi-preposition" in one special locution, *than whom*.

Everybody is familiar with the phrase *than whom*; and all who have read the literature closely have seen *than me* for *than I*, *than him* for *than he*, etc., in some of the most famous authors.

Nesfield treats this use of *than* very fully. In one place he has the locutions *than whom* and "other *than* wine," in both of which he parses *than* as a preposition. In another place he has, "No mightier *than* thyself or *me*," from Shakespeare; "*than them both*" from the Bible; "more *than me*"; "a much greater loser *than me*," from Swift; and others from Pope, Prior, Southey, and Caxton, in all of which he treats *than* as a preposition. In 1864, Dean Alford³ defended these same locutions, and said that *than* governed the objective case. He cited *than whom* from Milton, and said that "than who" would be intolerable. Some years later, Abbott, the famous Shakespearean grammarian, wrote a grammar for schools, in which he too said that *than who* would be intolerably harsh, and that hence *than whom* was evolved for the sake of euphony. In this particular phrase, he almost calls *than* a quasi-preposition.

George Campbell⁴ in 1776 had discussed these cases of *than*+the objective instead of the nominative. He treated *than* as a conjunction, but said that Joseph Priestley had treated it as a preposition. So we see that Nesfield is not proposing anything novel but simply joining forces with some of

¹ Nesfield: *English Grammar Past and Present*, pp. 94, 95.

² E. A. Abbott: *How to Parse*, p. 210.

³ *The Queen's English*, edition of 1866, pp. 152-154.

⁴ *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Book II, chap. III, section II.

the old grammarians. While we might regard the latter as rather out of date, we cannot say the same of the author of *English Grammar Past and Present*.

Quackenbos and Genung treat *than whom* as an anomalous expression and advise the student to avoid it. Baskervill and Sewell,¹ while advising us to use the nominative pronoun in the cases under discussion (*e.g.*, "He is taller than I") say that the other locution is used by many good writers. They quote sentences from Shakespeare, Pope, Southey, and Thackeray; *e.g.*, "She was neither better bred nor wiser than you or me," from Thackeray. Baskervill and Sewell recognize *than whom* as far better English than any of the other objectives with *than*. It is universally used, they say, but add that no special reason can be given. (Abbott gives "euphony," as we said in an earlier paragraph.) Lounsbury,² also, puts *than whom* on a higher plane than the others. He says that it has been both common and classical since the latter half of the sixteenth century. (The earliest cases the writer has seen were in Philip Sidney, Hooker, and Jeremy Taylor.) Lounsbury does not recognize *than me*, etc., as good English, but treats them as "irregular and careless." He does not parse *than* as a preposition, but regards "whom" as a relic coming down from the period of confusion in pronouns. The Century Dictionary regards these phrases as "blunderingly" used, but says that *than whom* is more usual than *than who*. (Is the latter ever used?) The New English Dictionary says, "As if *than* were a preposition. . . . *Than whom* is universally accepted instead of *than who*. With the personal pronouns it is now considered incorrect." This dictionary quotes examples of *than me*, *than him*, etc., from the Geneva Bible, Goldsmith, Scott, and Beddoes. Carpenter,³ the grammarian, says, "In such cases there has always been a tendency

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 280.

² *History of the English Language*, p. 298.

³ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 151, note.

to treat 'than' as a preposition followed by the objective case and to say 'he is taller than *me*.' Grammarians and rhetoricians insist that this construction is incorrect, and it is now largely confined to colloquial or vulgar English, except in the almost obsolete expression 'than whom,' which has been accepted, in spite of logic, as correct." Professor A. S. Hill cites Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Byron, Landor, and Thackeray as using *than whom*. Baskervill and Sewell quote Scott, Thackeray, and James Parton.

Carpenter's statements need careful sifting. First: he should say that *most* grammarians and rhetoricians regard all these locutions except *than whom* as incorrect. Secondly, he is hardly warranted in calling *than whom* almost obsolete; it is seen and heard frequently in platform English and is sometimes found in literature.

Jespersen¹ says, "This use of the accusative after *than* . . . is now so universal as to be considered the normal construction; that is, to the general feeling *than* is a preposition as well as a conjunction." The writer's course of reading does not corroborate this statement: these accusatives (objectives) were seen only occasionally in the standard authors.

We have already named the authors cited by Baskervill and by Nesfield as using *than me*, etc.; we may add those seen in a wide course of reading: *Than them* (= *than they*) is used by Adelaide Procter; *than me*, occasionally in Shakespeare, Swift, Prior, Pope, Dr. Johnson, Southey, Thackeray, Bulwer, and Clough; *than him* in Shakespeare, Johnson, and Kingsley; *than her* in Boswell and Prior. It has been said in earlier paragraphs that these phrases are found in the King James Bible, Caxton, the Genevan Bible, Goldsmith, Scott, Beddoes. Certainly there must be some better way to explain these phrases than to call them "blunders", "careless," etc. Are we consistent if we quote, say, ten or fifteen reputable authors to establish a locution and in the same breath quote possibly the

¹ *Progress in Language*, p. 199.

same group in a case like *than me* and call those men "careless", "blundering," etc.? If they can establish one locution, why not another?

It is almost inconceivable to the writer that *than* can be a preposition. On page 153 of this volume, the opinion was expressed that it would be better to regard *me* in some places as an irregular nominative than to treat *than* as a preposition.

Why, then, can we not conceive of *than* as a preposition? In the first place, it is historically an adverbial conjunction and is treated as such by Anglo-Saxon scholars. Secondly, if any of the sentences involving *than me*, *than him*, etc., were written out in full, the *I*, *he*, etc., would immediately be demanded, which proves that the pronouns are not real objectives. Thirdly, if *than* were a preposition, the objective pronoun would be the rule rather than the exception. In the next place, *than* is simply another form of *then*; the sentence "He is taller than I" means "He is taller, then I am tall"; who would ever imagine that *then* was or could be a preposition? Again: *than I* is treated by all the grammarians as an elliptical clause adverbially modifying some word or group in the other clause. If "me" happens to be used by some standard author, shall we say that *than me* is a prepositional adverb phrase? This is an absurdity. It is better to treat *me*, *him*, etc., as old nominatives fossilized in a few phrases, used irregularly, and gradually dropping out of the literary language.

In an earlier paragraph of this section, it has been said that Carpenter's statement that *than whom* is almost obsolete was too sweeping. The same thing may be said of Hill's statement that no careful author would write *than him*. Passages involving this locution have already been cited from Swift, Pope, Southey, and others not very remote, besides the Bible and Shakespeare, more ancient authorities.

The writer is not defending *than me*, etc., where *than I*, etc., would be expected. He is simply showing that they have been

in the language continuously for hundreds of years, used by the best authors, and is combating sweeping statements made by writers on propriety, statements based upon utterly inadequate reading of the literature. This volume aims to prove that the English language has always been liberal in its tendencies and free in its syntax and that, if not strait-jacketed by purists and pedants, it would give us wide liberty and free choice of expression in many cases. In the use of pronouns, especially, English has always been liberal and would continue to be so if left to its own devices.

A few complete passages showing the use of *than* + objective in the literature may be added.

Jeremy Taylor¹ says, "and all this for man, *than whom* nothing could be more miserable, thyself only excepted, who becamest so by undertaking our guilt and punishment." (Date 1650-51.) Richard Hooker² says, "Many men there are, *than whom* nothing is more commendable when they are singled." (Date, *ante* 1600.) Sidney³ says, "So grave Counsellors, as besides many, but before all, that Hospitall of Fraunce: *than whom*, (I thinke) that Realme never brought forth a more accomplished judgement, more firmly builded upon vertue." (About 1581.) These passages alone prove that Milton did not originate this phrase, though the fact that he used it in *Paradise Lost* helped no little in giving it wide currency.

That *than me*, *than him*, etc., are used by authors not known as careless, can be proved by a few quotations: Boswell⁴ says, "A woman does not complain that her brother, who is younger *than her*, gets their common father's estate." Pope says,

Some wit you have, and more may learn,
From Court, *than* Gay or *me*.

¹ *Holy Living*.

² *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

³ *Defense of Poesie*.

⁴ *Life of Johnson*.

Swift says,

And though by Heaven's severe decree
She suffers hourly more *than me*.

Clough makes Cain say,

O Abel, brother mine,
Where'er thou art, more happy far *than me*!

Nesfield quotes a sentence from Southey; Baskervill and Sewell quote from Southey and Byron. Passages from Thackeray are easily available. All these facts show that these locutions have an unbroken history in the literature for several centuries, and can hardly be ascribed to carelessness. The fact that they are exceptional, however, must make us careful not to say that they are standard English. "It will be safer for the student to follow the general rule," says an excellent textbook on grammar. "Follow the generality of usage of the generality of authors" would be safe advice to students of usage.

In conclusion, it may be added that *than I* is more literary and far more common in standard authors; *than me* is only occasional, and should be avoided by the student.

CXXIV

THAT AS AN ADVERB

What libertine would hesitate to promise *that much*? (Beecher.)

That has considerable vogue as an adverb in popular speech, and occasionally gets into literature. The sentence quoted above is used by Baskervill and Sewell¹ to show that well-known speakers and writers use it occasionally.

Dean Alford² calls it provincial and "quite indefensible." Abbott calls it provincial. Carpenter calls it "colloquial or vulgar." Baskervill and Sewell say, "very common as an

¹ *English Grammar*, p. 186.

² *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 82.

adverb in spoken English and now and then found in literary English." Some good grammars do not notice the adverbial *that*, even to condemn it. The Standard and the Century say, "colloquial"; but the latter quotes Bishop Hacket and Browning. Webster says, "Archaic or in illiterate use." The Encyclopedic Dictionary says, "Vulgar." A. S. Hill says, "not properly an adverb."

The present writer has seen no cases of the adverbial *that* in a wide course of reading.

It would seem from the foregoing statements that the overwhelming consensus of scholars is opposed to this use of *that*; why then discuss it? The answer the author would make is that, when a locution has considerable vogue in colloquial English of classes far above the vulgar and is also found occasionally in good authors, it is worth our notice as students of usage. Of one thing, moreover, we may be sure: Beecher and Browning did not originate this locution; it is found in embryo in the Anglo-Saxon period, being historically an adverbial genitive. There are several cases of it in *Beowulf*.

In the Valley of Virginia, *that* has wide vogue in "popular talk"; e.g., "I am *that* sick I can hardly stand up." In Eastern Virginia, the type of sentence quoted from Beecher is familiar colloquially; e.g., "I am not *that* foolish."

CXXV

THAT AS A COORDINATING RELATIVE

Some discarded Whig, *that* is sullen and says nothing because he is out of place. (*Addison* in the *Spectator*.)

The *that* in the sentence quoted above is the coördinating relative: it introduces an additional fact about its antecedent. The majority of our best grammarians condemn it, saying that *who* should be used and that *that* is wrong. Alexander Bain¹

¹ *Composition Grammar*, pp. 67, 68.

says, *that* . . . has never been much used in the coördinating sense for *who* or *which*. Thackeray occasionally affects this usage." Bain takes a sentence of the same kind from Shakespeare and one from Goldsmith and corrects both of them, showing us how he has improved them. As to Thackeray's "occasional" use of this *that*, see the table below, in which there are thirty-five cases from *Henry Esmond* and seven from various essays of Thackeray's. Hundreds could be found in his volumes. Where is the affectation?

Carpenter¹ says, "*That* is almost always a restrictive relative, that is, it introduces a group of words which limit the meaning of its antecedent, much as an adjective would." Abbott² says, "*Who* introduces a new fact about the antecedent; *that* completes the antecedent. This is the general rule, subject to a few exceptions arising from the desire for euphony." Baskervill and Sewell³ say, "*That* is in most cases restrictive, the coördinating use not being often found among careful writers." Let the tables refute this statement. Nesfield⁴ says, "*Who* and *which* are the only Relatives that are used in the sense of Continuation. . . . *that* is invariably used in a Restrictive sense. . . . we do not say, 'my father, *that*,' " etc. How incorrect this statement is can be seen by glancing over the list of more than 100 authors that use the coördinating *that* in at least 1100 passages. Indeed, we can see this *that* in reputable and famous authors every day. Kittredge and Farley⁵ in their recent textbook say, "*That* is not now employed as a descriptive relative, though it was common in this use not very long ago." This is the most incorrect statement ever made by Professor Kittredge. Whitney⁶ takes another view: "Some authorities hold that *who* and

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 90.

² *How to Parse*, p. 307, note 1.

³ *English Grammar*, p. 290.

⁴ *English Grammar Past and Present*, pp. 43, 44.

⁵ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 71, note 1.

⁶ *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 77.

which are to be used as coördinating or simply descriptive relatives, but *that* as limiting or restrictive. . . . But the best English usage by no means requires such a distinction."

Having quoted some of the best grammarians of our day, let us turn to the rhetorical scholars. Genung¹ says, "The relative *that* is used only to introduce subordinate clauses necessary to define or restrict or complete our thought of the antecedent." A. S. Hill² is nearer right: "Some grammarians would reserve *that* for clauses which restrict the meaning of the antecedent . . . but the warmest advocates of the rule admit that there are important exceptions to it, and that it finds little support in the practice of reputable authors."

Here we have seven authorities against this use of *that* and only two for it. Let us turn to the literature and see which group has based its statements upon these supreme authorities.

Chester Plays	1	George Chapman	5
Interlude of Thersytes	1	Sir Thomas Browne	13
Earl of Surrey	2	Richard Baxter	1
John Heywood	1	Jeremy Taylor	7
John Bale	3	Herrick	4
Gorboduc	6	Milton	59
John Skelton	3	Andrew Marvell	5
Shakespeare	84	Cowley	1
Titus Andronicus	8	Samuel Butler	3
Fletcher and Shakespeare	11	Dryden	20
King James Bible	55	Pepys	1
Massinger	56	Pope	5
Marlowe	93	Bishop Burnet	14
John Webster	9	Prior	1
Bacon	35	Swift	4
Prayer Book	8	Addison	28
Walter Raleigh	2	Dr. Johnson	2
John Lyly	7	Goldsmith	2
Beaumont and Fletcher	2	Gray	8
Spenser	59	John Locke	1

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 93.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 126.

Franklin	3	Jean Ingelow.....	1
Cowper	2	A. H. Clough.....	10
Gibbon	2	Henry Taylor	1
Coleridge	3	Hallam	3
Lamb	39	Edward Everett	2
Scott	5	Kingsley	2
Leigh Hunt	1	W. W. Skeat	1
Keats	13	Swinburne	16
Philip Freneau	15	Dr. C. Geikie.....	1
John Howard Payne.....	1	Stedman	2
Irving	2	William Watson	2
Kirke Paulding	1	Phillips Brooks.....	2
Wordsworth	42	Stevenson	12
William Collins	1	Dr. Henry van Dyke.....	13
Southey	1	Phoebe Cary	3
Thomas Campbell	3	Stephen Phillips	6
Edward Young	1	Adelaide Procter	3
F. W. Faber	1	William Minto	2
Jeffrey	1	Sidney Lanier	3
Mrs. Gaskell	1	Carlyle	1
Bryant	36	P. H. Hayne	12
John Keble	11	Tennyson	38
Mrs. E. B. Browning.....	11	Matthew Arnold	1
Bulwer	3	Browning	34
George Eliot	4	G. W. Cable.....	16
Thackeray	42	Fiske	1
Hawthorne	7	Bret Harte	5
De Quincey.....	9	T. B. Aldrich.....	1
Christopher North	6	Brander Matthews	1
Poe	11	H. W. Mabie.....	3
D. G. Rossetti	6	T. N. Page	1
Longfellow	33	Andrew Lang.....	6
Lowell	7	D. G. Mitchell	17
Morris	22	G. K. Chesterton	1
Prescott	6	Stopford Brooke	1
Cooper	13	George William Curtis.....	3
Holmes	6	Ernest Rhys	2
Dickens	3		

Here are 115 authorities covering a period of about 400 years, and about 1100 passages. The locution was strong all through the last century.

The recent authors that use the coördinating *that* most frequently are Thackeray, Bryant, Morris, Browning, Tennyson, Cooper, P. H. Hayne, Cable, D. G. Mitchell, Swinburne, and Henry van Dyke. It was very strong in Spenser, Shakespeare, the Bible, Marlowe, Bacon, Milton, Addison, Lamb, Wordsworth. When has it ever been rare in literature?

It is not accidental that the poets show such large figures in the table. *Which* is a heavy and rather ugly word, hard to pronounce rapidly and smoothly; *that* slides off the tongue much more easily. Let us illustrate by a line in the first poem seen in the newest magazine:

And, folk whose earth-stained looks I hate,
 Why may I not divine
 Your Souls, *that* must be passionate,
 Shining and swift as mine?

Here is a case from the throbbing heart of the living language. The poet uses *that*. Apply the rules of the textbooks and the melody is impaired; the poet's instinct rose above the canons of technical grammar.

The rule is stricter than the language and should be modified. Some day the language may make *who* and *which* coördinating and *that* restricting; but it has not yet done so, as *who* and *which* are very frequently restrictive and *that* often coördinative, as seen above.

Milton says, in *Paradise Lost*,

Here pilgrims roam, *that* stray'd so far to seek
 In Golgotha him dead who lives in Heaven.

Satan from hence, now on the lower stair,
That scal'd by steps of gold to Heaven-gate,
 Looks down, *etc.*

Pope says,

And now the chapel's silver bell you hear,
That summons you to all the pride of pray'r.

Huge theatres, *that* now unpeopled woods,
 Now drained a distant country of her floods.

Addison (*Spectator*) says, "This . . . will never be decided until we have something like an academy, *that* by the best authorities and rules drawn from the analogy of languages shall settle all controversy between grammar and idiom."

Swift says, "is a manifest breach of the fundamental law, *that* makes this majority of opinions the voice of God." And:

Or mere chimeras in the mind,
That fly, and leave no marks behind?

Dryden says,

Those are Grecian ghosts, *that* in battle were slain.

Thomas Gray (*Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College*) says,

And Shame *that* skulks behind.
 Or Jealousy, with rankling tooth,
That inly gnaws the secret heart.

George Eliot (*Adam Bede*) says, "a little smouldering vague anxiety, *that* might easily die out again, was the utmost effect Dinah's preaching had wrought in them at present." Swinburne, who uses the coördinating *that* frequently, says,

The last was Fear, *that* is akin to Death.
 Sweet love, *that* yet art living man.
 God, *that* makes time and ruins it.

Keats says,

Through sunny meadows, *that* outskirt the side
 Of thine enmossed realms?
 Or maiden's sigh, *that* grief itself embalms.

Tennyson says,

Smote the chord of Self, *that*, trembling, pass'd in music out of sight.

De Quincey says, "the idea of secret perfidy, *that* was constantly moving under-ground, gave an interest to the progress of the war," etc.; also "Apparently this young generation, *that* ought to have been so good, took no warning," etc.

If hundreds or thousands of sentences from reputable authors can refute the statements of grammarians and writers on usage we can say that Bain, Abbott, and many others are in serious error in this matter: *who* and *which* have not driven "the Jack Sprat *that*" out of this territory.

The writer has noticed that Jespersen, the famous English scholar of Denmark, uses the coördinating *that* frequently, so that we may quote him on the affirmative,

CXXVI

THEE AS A QUASI-NOMINATIVE

I would not be *thee*. (*Shakespeare.*)

On pages 153 ff., *me* was treated as a quasi-nominative; *thee* may be treated in the same manner. T. L. K. Oliphant¹ in his *New English* quotes from Shakespeare the sentence which stands at the head of this section, and says, "There is a curious substitution of the Accusative for the Nominative in Pronouns." In the same volume,² however, under the year 1762, speaking of Foote's *Orators*, he says, "The strange Nominative *thee* appears; *thee must learn*; this was adopted by the Quakers." This Quaker *thee* has been explained by an American scholar as "an old dative-nominative."

Mätzner³ discusses the confusion in pronoun forms from *Piers Plowman*, through Shakespeare and Dryden, down to Goldsmith. Both Mätzner and Oliphant quote "Lord y-worshipped be *the*," where *the* = thou. As *thee* (=as thou) occurs

¹ *The New English*, II, 40.

² P. 180.

³ *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), I, 294, 295.

in Prior, Steele, James Thomson, and William Cullen Bryant. Prior says, "which once was *thee*"; Thomson, "The nations not so blessed as *thee*."

Dean Alford¹ and others have explained *thee* in *as thee* as objective after the preposition "as." The writer, however, cannot conceive of "as" as a preposition in such a location but prefers to regard *thee* as an old nominative. (See page 153, above, for this writer's view of *than me*.)

The English pronouns took a long time to settle down. "Between you and I" is so common in Shakespeare that it has been called a Shakespearean idiom, and is explained scientifically by scholars at home and abroad. Wycherley, about 1660, says "*thee* and I"; "*us* could not deny"; "it was *me*." In the Miracle Plays "*us*" occurs sometimes for *we*. The quotations from Prior and Steele are typical of the language used in the Augustan era; Foote and Thomson are pretty recent. In extempore discourse, educated men not infrequently use *than me* for *than I* and other locutions of like character; in print they would correct them. Pronouns are very slippery things, and we cannot look at them too closely in the literature.

Steele in the *Spectator* says, "When two such as *thee* and I meet, with affections as we ought to have towards each other, thou shouldst rejoice," etc. Prior says,

May some kind friend the piteous object see,
And equal rites perform to that which once was *thee*.

The most recent case of *as thee* seen in this course of reading is in *The Greck Boy* by Bryant:

Her youth renewed in such *as thee*.

¹ *The Queen's English*, 1866, p. 160.

· CXXVII

THINK FOR

The author has heard the phrase *think for* so often among intelligent people that he watched it in the literature. Just as expected, it turned out that it was used by some authors, not only reputable, but very eminent. For instance, William Morris in *Sir Peter Harpdon's End* says,

well, well, perhaps
They're stronger than I *think for*.

Dickens in *Pickwick Papers* says, “she brightened up too, and looked rather knowing, as if matrimony in reality were not quite so far off as some people *thought for*.”

Thackeray and Holmes use this phrase occasionally.

CXXVIII

THOUSAND FOR A OR THE THOUSAND

Thousand is used without the article pretty often by the poets. It can be found in the following:

Spenser	2	Pope	4
Fletcher and Shakespeare.....	3	Prior	2
Marlowe	2	Keats	1
Shakespeare	1	Collins	2
Milton	1	Browning	1

Only one case was seen in prose—in Carlyle—who often uses poetical phraseology.

Pope says,

When *thousand* worlds are round.

Keats says,

And in the midst, 'mong *thousand* heraldries,
And twilight saints.

A more familiar passage is the following from Milton's *Hymn on the Nativity*:

The air, such pleasure loath to lose,
With *thousand* echoes still prolongs each heavenly close.

Metrical considerations no doubt led all the poets in the list to omit the article.

CXXIX

THRIVED OR THROVE?

What is the past tense of *thrive*? The writer has often hesitated which to say. Let us see what the grammarians, the lexicographers, and the authors do in the matter.

The Standard Dictionary.....	<i>throve</i> , rarely <i>thrived</i>
Worcester	<i>throve</i>
Century	<i>throve</i> , sometimes <i>thrived</i>
Webster	<i>throve</i> or <i>thrived</i>
Carpenter	<i>throve</i> , <i>thrived</i>
Baskerville and Sewell.....	<i>throve</i> (<i>thrived</i>)
Alexander Bain	<i>throve</i> (<i>thrived</i>)
Whitney	<i>throve</i> (<i>thrived</i>)
Meiklejohn	<i>throve</i> (<i>thrived</i>)
Nesfield	<i>throve</i> (<i>thrived</i>)
Kittredge and Farley.....	<i>throve</i> , <i>thrived</i>

From this table we see that both forms are recognized but that *throve* is the preferred form in the grammars.

Turning to the authors, we have the following record:

1. THROVE

Mrs. Gaskell	1	Mrs. H. Ward.....	1
Hallam	1	Swinburne	1
Browning	1	John Fiske	1
Kingsley	1	Tennyson	1
Hawthorne	1	H. W. Mabie.....	1
George Eliot	2	Stedman	1

2. THRIVED (PRETERITE)

Massinger	1	W. M. Baskervill.....	1
Dryden	1	John Fiske	1
George Eliot	1		

Lounsbury in his *The Standard of Usage in English*¹ says that the two forms are used indifferently and that no one can predict which will ultimately prevail. It would seem, however, that this statement may have to be revised. If 11 authorities are unanimously in favor of *throve* while several of them give little or no recognition to *thrived*, and if 11 out of 14 authors cited from the nineteenth century use *throve*, why can we not say that *throve* is decidedly in the ascendant?

The word in its past participle and past tense is not very common in literature. Probably the authors were uncertain as to the forms and used other verbs such as *succeeded*, *prospered*, etc. The forms *throve*, *thriven*, and *thrived* are, it would seem, rather rare in conversation: the writer confesses to some hesitancy in using them.

A few quotations will show how the forms are used by the great authors. Tennyson in *The Palace of Art* says,

And so she *throve* and prosper'd: so three years
She prosper'd.

Browning in *Childe Roland* says,

I think I never saw
Such starved, ignoble nature; nothing *throve*.

Swinburne in *Faustine* says,

But this time Satan *throve*, no doubt.

The verb *thrive* started out in Middle English as a strong verb and is now, it would seem, reverting to that class.

¹ P. 145.

CXXX

THOROUGHLY

Thoroughly is used in the Bible and in the Prayer Book, and is familiar to every close reader of Shakespeare. In cheap editions of the Bible, it is often changed to *thoroughly*. "Wash me *thoroughly* from my sins," though regularly printed in the Prayer Book and in carefully edited Bibles, is often changed by public readers into "Wash me *thoroughly*." Students in college classes have to be taught the word *thoroughly* in their Shakespeare classes.

The old adverb *thoroughly* is used by Tillotson, N. Ward, and Dryden, one of the dictionaries tells us. The writer has seen it in Prior and in Tennyson. Of course it is obsolete now except in poetry.

Prior in his ballad of *Down-Hall* says,

For, before this great journey was *thoroughly* concerted,
Full often they met, and as often they parted.

CXXXI

TOMORROW IS SUNDAY

Quackenbos¹ condemns the use of *is* with the word *tomorrow*; he says, "As well say, 'Yesterday is Sunday.'"

Lounsbury² defends stoutly, and explains *is* as a survival of the present tense used with future meaning, so common in early English and still used to a considerable degree in the best English. Hill permits both but draws a fine distinction.

Tomorrow is and *tomorrow will be* are both used in polite society; the writer did not see either phrase in the literature, hence cannot quote passages. *Tomorrow is* is far more usual in polite colloquial English.

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, edition of 1896, p. 245.

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 167.

CXXXII

TRY AND OR TRY TO

Both Quackenbos¹ and Genung² condemn *try and*; e.g., “*Try and do better.*” Baskervill and Sewell,³ “Occasionally . . . found . . . instead of the better authorized *try to.*” They, however, quote Thackeray, Alexander Bain, and Ruskin as using *try and*. A. S. Hill⁴ approves of *try and*.

Try and is used by the following:

Baxter	1	Mrs. Gaskell.....	1
Lamb	4	Kingsley	1
Matthew Arnold.....	4	George Eliot	5
Thackeray	9	T. L. K. Oliphant.....	1
Froude	1	Sir John Lubbock.....	1

Try and is used several times in Otto Jespersen's books. How can the locution be called a colloquialism, with such support in literature?

Try to is often less easy of utterance than *try and*; e.g., “We ought to *try to* take our part.” Here the “t”-sounds are hard to pronounce and not pleasant to the ear. *Try to* is more strictly grammatical, but euphony has its rights.

Matthew Arnold (*Essays in Criticism*) says, “How serious a matter it is to *try and resist*, I had ample opportunity of experiencing,” etc., and “every critic should *try and possess* one great literature, at least, besides his own.” Froude says, “To *try and teach* people how to live without giving them examples in which our rules are illustrated, is,” etc. George Eliot says (*Silas Marner*) “to *try and soften* his father's anger,” etc.; “to *try and choose* your lot,” etc.

¹ *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, pp. 245, 246.

² *Outlines of Rhetoric*, 1900, p. 331.

³ *English Grammar*, p. 330.

⁴ *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, p. 16.

CXXXIII

VOICE AS A VERB

Rather assume thy Right in Silence and *de facto* then *voice* it with Claimes and Challenges. (*Lord Bacon.*)

Voice as a verb in the meaning of *assert*, *utter* is sometimes condemned by writers on usage. Genung¹ says, "is much used nowadays, but the usage is objectionable." Lounsbury² defends it, and says that Shakespeare³ uses it. Worcester recognizes it. The Century Dictionary recognizes it, quoting a passage from the *North American Review*. Webster recognizes it, quoting two passages from Bacon, one of them being the same one quoted at the head of this section. The Encyclopedic and the Standard dictionaries recognize it.

The following authors use the word:

Bacon	1	Price Collier	1
Stopford Brooke.....	1	Brander Matthews.....	2
G. K. Chesterton.....	1	T. N. Page	1

If the Century Dictionary can quote the *North American Review*, the authors named in the table above should carry weight, as any of them might write articles that would grace that magazine.

The word seems to have lain dormant for a long time and reemerged in the nineteenth century.

G. K. Chesterton in his *Life of Browning* says, "what figures Browning has selected as *voicing* the essential and distinct versions of the case." Price Collier in his *England and the English* says, "to *voice* the fact that they are a Christian nation." L. A. Sherman in his *Analytics of Literature* says, "She is made to serve the audience as a sort of proxy, *voicing* and obeying its will."

¹ *Outlines of Rhetoric*, p. 331

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 202.

³ See *Coriolanus* II, iii, l. 222.

The locution is heard not infrequently among reputable speakers and has some vogue in polite conversation; but it is true that it is a "pet word" with a certain class of speakers not recognized as authorities. As said already, it is perfectly natural for a noun to become a verb.

CXXXIV

WAS FOR SUBJUNCTIVE WERE

They speak as if the scholar's judgment *was* one thing, and the general public's judgment another. (*Matthew Arnold.*)

The sentence quoted above is typical. It is taken from a famous essay by one of the best stylists of the nineteenth century. Let us see what the greater grammarians say about this *was* used where *were* is generally expected. Of course "the lesser grammarians" will not tolerate it: we *must* use *were* in certain places.

Mätzner¹ says that the subjunctive has never had the monopoly in clauses like the one in Arnold's sentence. He quotes *was* from Sheridan, Bolingbroke, and Bulwer where *were* would be more strictly elegant. Henry Bradley,² speaking of the decline of the subjunctive, says, "Perhaps in another generation the subjunctive forms will have ceased to exist except in the single instance of *were*, which serves a useful function, although we manage to dispense with a corresponding form in other verbs." Professor George P. Krapp³ takes the same view as Bradley. After borrowing from C. Alphonso Smith cases of *was* for *were* taken from Thackeray, Matthew Arnold, and Dean Church, he says that it is doubtful whether the subjunctive can keep this its "last stronghold" much longer against the encroachments of the indicative.

¹ *English Grammar* (Grece's translation), II, 120.

² *The Making of English*, p. 53.

³ *Modern English*, p. 290.

Carpenter¹ says, "In constructions of this sort . . . the indicative may be used; *e.g.*, "I wish it *was* in my power." Leon Kellner² devotes a long chapter to the general decline of the subjunctive mood in English. Under the head of *was* as driving out *were*, he names Bunyan, Addison, Sterne, Maria Edgeworth, Dickens, Trollope, and R. L. Stevenson as using *was*.

The opinions of these grammarians must carry weight with the most rigid precisians. If not, the usage of the authors already cited may carry some conviction. To this array of authorities this writer will add the following cases which he has seen in the literature:

Richard Baxter	4	Thackeray	14
Congreve	1	Landor	1
Addison	4	Sidney Lanier	1
Defoe	1	Matthew Arnold	1
Steele	1	J. A. Froude	8
Lady Mary Wortley Montagu	4	Bulwer	1
Bishop Burnet	1	Kingsley	3
Dr. Johnson	1	Holmes	7
Thomas Warton	1	Emerson	1
John Adams	1	John Lubbock	1
Sterne	1	Brander Matthews	6
Fielding	2	Lyman Abbott	1
Jane Austen	1	D. G. Mitchell	4
Irving	2	Sir Henry Taylor	3
William Hazlitt	3	Lounsbury	1
Burke	1	Justin McCarthy	1
Franklin	1	Henry van Dyke	1
Lamb	5	G. W. Cable	1
Gladstone	1	Phillips Brooks	2
Beaconsfield	1	Stevenson	2

Five of the greatest grammarians and about fifty authors from Baxter to the present show that *was* in the unreal condition and in the clause of "wishing" is making inroads upon

¹ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 188.

² *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 244.

the territory of *were*. Whether we like it or not, such are the facts.

Thackeray uses this form frequently; probably fifty cases of it could be found in his novels. Among living writers of repute, Professor Brander Matthews probably uses *was* for *were* most frequently. Of course *were* is the prevailing form in standard literature, but *was* should not be called a vulgarism.

Such facts must make us tolerant. We may prefer the subjunctive. The present writer may say that personally he enjoys it; he likes to hear a group of elegant subjunctives fall from the lips of a public speaker. But the facts are stubborn: the subjunctive has been giving way for over two hundred years in its "last stronghold" and is probably doomed to extinction. Yet the writer would welcome some effort on the part of the educated classes to save this subjunctive *were*: its abandonment would be a distinct loss to the language.

Addison says, "Sir Roger told me . . . that the country people would be tossing her into a pond and trying experiments with her every day, if it *was* not for him and his chaplain"; "I could wish . . . that there *was* such a kind of everlasting drapery to be made use of by all," etc. Burke says, "would to God there *was* no other arbiter to decide on the vote," etc. Jane Austen says, "'Haye Park might do,' said she, 'if the Gouldings would quit it, or the great house at Stoke, if the drawing-room *was* larger.'" Fielding makes his hero say, "*Was* I but possessed of thee, one only suit of rags thy whole estate, is there a man on earth whom I would envy!" Dr. Johnson says, "He passed week after week in clambering the mountains, to see if there *was* any aperture which the bushes might conceal," etc. Emerson says, "It was very easy for manufacturers less shrewd than those of Birmingham and Manchester to see, that if the state of things in the island *was* altered, if the slaves had wages, the slaves would be clothed," etc. Stevenson says, "Nor was this all; for suppose I *was*

arrested when I was alone, there was little against me; but suppose I *was* taken in company with the reputed murderer, my case would begin to be grave.”

As to the earliest appearance of this *was*, there has been some discussion. In Mätzner, Kellner, the New English Dictionary, and other authorities, there is no case cited as early as the four from Baxter (about 1650) recorded in the writer's notes.

The present writer is not aware of any “trace of consciousness” in using *were*, and will not confess to any affectation in the matter. Krapp is certainly mistaken.¹

CXXXV

WHAT USED OF PERSONS

Conjecturing *what*, or who he could be, that, in these rude and unfrequented regions, had leisure and art for such harmless luxury. (*Johnson*.)

What is rarely used of persons in modern English but was so used frequently in Anglo-Saxon. It comes on down through Caxton, Malory, the Miracle Plays, and Latimer, and is strong in Shakespeare. It would not be treated in this volume if it had not been seen in still more recent authors. One passage—taken from Johnson—is quoted at the head of this section. The writer has seen three cases of this *what* in Congreve, one in Massinger, one in Ben Jonson, one in Lamb, one in Cooper, and two in Tennyson.

Abbott² gives seven passages from Shakespeare; the writer has seen nine others. Typical passages are, “*What's* he that goes there?” “*What's* he that wishes so?” Abbott² suggests that, in Shakespeare's day, when the question of rank was prominent, *what* was natural. This might explain Johnson's use of *what* and *who* in the sentence at the head of this section

¹ See *Modern English*, p. 290.

² *Shakespearian Grammar*, p. 174.

but would not explain many cases in other periods of English. Congreve in *The Mourning Bride* says,

García, *what's* he, who with contracted brow
And sullen port, glooms downward with his eyes?

Again:

What's he, who like thyself is startled here
Ere seen?

Charles Lamb in his *Farewell to Tobacco* says,

Bacchus we know, and we allow'
His tipsy rites. But *what* art thou
That but by reflex canst show
What his deity can do?

In *Lancelot and Elaine*, l. 469, Lancelot's kith and kin, not recognizing him, said,

Lo!

What is he?

Of course this use of *what* is archaic, and is recorded only in the interests of lexicography.

CXXXVI

WHETHER AS INTERROGATIVE PARTICLE

The writer has seen a few late survivals of *whether* as an interrogative particle. As the word is not in use now except as a conjunction, either standing alone or followed by "or," it may be well to tell briefly some of its obsolete uses.

As an interrogative pronoun (=which of two?) it is familiar in Bible English; e.g., "*Whether* of them twain did the will of his father?" This is seen in Jeremy Taylor, Philip Sidney, and as late as Swift's *Battle of the Books* (1704). Again: *whether* was frequently used by Wycliffe as an interrogative particle equivalent to Latin *nonne* and by Latimer

as an interrogative particle expecting the answer "no." Chaucer uses it where either answer might be expected. We find a familiar passage in the *Merchant of Venice*, when Bassanio says,

Move these eyes?
Or *whether*, riding on the balls of mine,
Seem they in motion? (III, ii, 117.)

The editors of Shakespeare either pass over this passage or misunderstand it. The quartos sometimes wrote *whither*, the particle not being familiar to editors and printers. Chaucer has this same use of *whether* along with other uses. This *whether* is found in a letter of Thomas Jefferson, written in 1813. Writing to a grammarian and predicting the rise of dialects in various parts of the English world, he asks, "But *whether* will these adulterate or enrich the English language?" (We have found Jefferson a little late in holding on to one or two other old locutions. See *you was*, page 331, below.)

A very similar use of *whether* is seen in Boswell's *Johnson* under the year 1783. A visitor talking with Dr. Johnson asked him, "*Whether* do you reckon Derriek or Smart the best poet?" These are the most recent cases of the old *whether* that the author has seen in the literature. They are thirty years apart in time, but the men that used them were contemporaries.

While all these uses of *whether* are extinct in standard literature, we occasionally hear them in the conversation and informal speech of educated people of America. For instance, in southern Illinois we hear educated people say, "*Whether* of these two books do you like best?" This is a sporadic survival of the old pronoun used in the Bible, Sidney, Jeremy Taylor, Dean Swift, and others.

Jeremy Taylor uses the old pronoun *whether*=*which of two*: "*Whether* is worse, the adultery of the man or the woman?" Swift says, "*whether* is the nobler being of the two?" This last is the latest example of the pronoun the

writer has seen in the literature, Jefferson's *whether* being more of a particle than pronoun.

The author has never heard any of these old *whethers* in the South, but southern Illinois was settled largely by emigration from the Southern states.

CXXXVII

WHO FOR WHOM

Who do we choose for the county member, etc.? (Froude.)

In 1867, Richard Grant White¹ said that the objective *whom* was "visibly disappearing." A few years later Bain,² the eminent Scotch grammarian, said, "*Who* may also be regarded as a modern objective form, side by side with *whom*. For many good writers and speakers say, 'who are you talking of?' 'who does the garden belong to?'" Abbott³ says that the inflection of *who* is frequently neglected by Shakespeare, and quotes six passages from his plays—mostly different from those cited in the table below. Baskervill and Sewell⁴ say, "In spoken English, *who* is used as objective instead of *whom*." George P. Krapp⁵ says, "can be condemned in practice only by the believer in the rigid theoretical system of grammar." Carpenter⁶ says that *whom* is required in literary English but that *who* can scarcely be regarded as incorrect in colloquial English. Professor O. F. Emerson⁷ says that *who* is used for *whom* frequently in Elizabethan English and cites three passages from Shakespeare. Lounsbury⁸ defends *who* as objective and says that *whom* in inter-

¹ *Words and Their Uses*, p. 319.

² *Higher English Grammar*, p. 141.

³ *Shakspearian Grammar*, p. 187.

⁴ *English Grammar*, p. 73.

⁵ *Modern English*, p. 301.

⁶ *Principles of English Grammar*, p. 88, note 2.

⁷ *History of the English Language*, pp. 333, 334.

⁸ *History of the English Language*, p. 291.

rogative sentences is regarded by many educated men as pedantic. He says that *who* is used by Peele, Greene, Ben Jonson, Shakespeare, and others, especially in conversation. Sweet says, "In present spoken English *whom* may be said to be extinct except in the rare construction with a preposition before it, as in *of whom are you speaking?*" Jespersen¹ says, "it would be an easy matter to find hundreds of examples from the Modern English period." The author of this volume may say that he has seen only twenty-five cases in thousands of pages. Jespersen adds that in some of the dialects, including the Scotch, *whom* has been superseded by *who*.

Professor Kittredge² is much stricter than some of the authorities quoted: he says, "Care should be taken not to write *who* for *whom*."

The writer has seen the objective *who* in the following:

Shakespeare	17	Pepys	1
Titus Andronicus	1	Kingsley	1
Marlowe	2	Froude	1
Defoe	6		

As seen in the table, the writer has recorded seventeen cases in Shakespeare; but this of course would not justify its use in present literary English: the pronouns were utterly unsettled in the Elizabethan period.

Few of the textbooks give us any inkling that this objective *who* could possibly have any standing. Our children are taught to regard it as an egregious error on a par with *done* for *did* and the double negative. If our schoolbooks would only grade the errors and not put them all on a dead equality! Errors differ in grade: some are venial; others, egregious.

Defoe uses this *who* at least six times in his *History of the Plague*. For using this and other locutions that are being schoolmastered out of the language, Defoe has been stigma-

¹ *Progress in Language*, pp. 214, 215.

² Kittredge and Farley's *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 74.

tized as ungrammatical. Defoe says, "But then my servant, *who* I had intended to take down with me, deceived me," etc.; "and *who* to intrust my affairs with." Pepys says, "To church, where we had common prayer, and a dull sermon by one Mr. Case, *who* yet I heard sing very well." Kingsley in *Hereward* puts this *who* into the mouth of a character that uses very correct grammar: "I hang thee, poor soul! *Who* did I ever hang, or hurt for a moment, if I could help it?" This, and the cases from Froude and Kingsley, are the latest found in this course of reading.

The objective *who* seems to be very rare in the literature of the last two centuries; the writer cannot produce authority enough to justify it. In conversation, however, it has considerable vogue, as we have found from several eminent English scholars.

Whom for *who* occurs occasionally in the literature. It is seen in the Bible of 1611 several times; e.g., "*Whom* do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?"; "But *whom* say ye that I am." Benjamin Franklin and Bret Harte use it. Shakespeare¹ uses it in *Cymbeline* and other plays. A closer study of *whom* than the writer has made would probably show that the confusion in pronouns, so widespread in the Elizabethan period, led to the use of *whom* for *who* pretty frequently; a few more cases may be cited. Franklin² says, "in the first place, I advise you to apply to all those *whom* you know will give something." Shakespeare says, "*whom* in constancy you think stands so safe"; "Young Ferdinand *whom* they suppose is drowned."

¹ See Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar*, § 410.

² *Autobiography*, chap. IX.

CXXXVIII

WHOSE REFERRING TO NEUTER ANTECEDENTS

The Romance family of languages, *whose* common parent-language is Latin. (*Henry Sweet.*)

In some quarters there is still a strong prejudice against the neuter *whosc*. The old grammarians and some of the later tell us that *whose* should not be applied to things without life, but that *of which* is the proper relative construction. The sentence at the head of this section is typical of the contrary use. It is taken from a book by one of the most eminent students of English.

One of the first modern scholars to question this locution was George P. Marsh,¹ whose name is familiar to all that love good English. In 1859 he said, "At present, the use of *whosc*, the possessive of *who*, is pretty generally confined to persons, or things personified, and we should scruple to say, 'I passed a house *whose* windows were open.' This is a modern, and indeed by no means yet fully established distinction." The table below will show how many great authors had been using this *whose* and were using it when Marsh published his lectures; they do not "scruple."

Nesfield says, "The *whose* of Modern English is generally limited to persons, though we sometimes find it applied to things as an equivalent to *of which*. . . . Our language has gained nothing but inconvenience by restricting the use of *whose* to persons, and it may be hoped that the older practice of using *whose* for all genders will be some day resumed." Whether the first statement is true or not the table will show. That avoiding *whose* and using *of which* is very inconvenient is certainly true; and we may add, cumbersome and pedantic. That Nesfield's hope has been realized for hundreds of years will be seen from a glance at the table below.

¹ Yet he uses it at least three times in his *Lectures*.

Carpenter says, "By a sort of personification, . . . *whose* sometimes refers to things." How often the writer has seen it in one course of reading the table will show. "*Sometimes*" is a decided understatement. Furthermore, if Carpenter's explanation is right, personification is certainly running mad in our literature.

Henry Sweet¹ says, "The possessive *whose* is still applied to lifeless things, though with a certain hesitation, and only to avoid the longer *of which*. In the spoken language we avoid such constructions as 'a tree *whose* shade' as much as possible." Whether the reputable authors feel Sweet's hesitation, the table will decide. In England they may use *of which* in colloquial speech, but the writer does not believe this is the case in America. In his books Sweet uses *whose* sometimes, though he may have done so "with hesitation." Goold Brown says, "I dislike the construction and yet sometimes adopt it for want of another as good."

A. S. Hill in his *Rhetoric*² says that good authors generally use *of which*, although, he adds, it would be going too far to say, "as some grammarians do," that *whose* should never stand for an inanimate thing not personified. He then gives some sentences in which *whose* is to be changed to *of which*. The writer has found warm opposition to *whose* in quarters where Professor Hill's influence as a teacher is still potent. Genung in his schoolbook says that this *whose* should be sparingly used and only when smoothness demands it; yet there are in Genung's college textbooks at least forty-five cases of *whose* used of inanimate objects.

The foregoing paragraphs set forth pretty fully the opposition to *whose* among the best authorities of our day. Let us now quote some of its defenders.

Mätzner³ puts this *whose* on an equality with the personal

¹ *New English Grammar*, Part II, p. 78.

² *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*, pp. 127, 128.

³ *English Grammar* (Greece's translation), II, pp. 518, 519.

use, but says that it is modern. The examples cited below, however, go back as far as Malory, John Bale, Gorbodue, the Earl of Surrey, becoming very numerous in Shakespeare and Marlowe. Bain¹ says it can be used except in cases where ambiguity would arise. Baskervill and Sewell² say, "Grammarians sometimes object to the statement that *whose* is the possessive of *which*, saying that the phrase *of which* should always be used instead; yet a search in literature shows that the possessive form *whose* is quite common in prose as well as in poetry." They cite the following authors as using it:

Burke	Ruskin
Scott	Matthew Arnold
Macaulay	McMaster
Kingsley	Beecher
Thackeray	

Meiklejohn,³ the Scotch grammarian, says, "*Whose* may be used for *of which*." Lounsbury⁴ is very strong in his defense of *whose*. He says that it is etymologically correct and is supported by the usage of "every author in our literature who is entitled to be called an authority." Whether this statement is too sweeping or not can be determined from the table below. Professor John Earle⁵ says, "*Whose* has long been used of persons only, but there is now a disposition, notably among our historians, to restore its pristine right of referring to things also." The last clause is excellent; but our table will show that *whose* has never been confined to persons. Kittredge and Farley⁶ recognize both *whose* and *of which*. They add that *of which* is preferred in prose, a statement which the writer believes to be erroneous. The Century Dictionary says that *whose* is still correctly used of a neuter antecedent.

¹ *Composition Grammar*, p. 71.

² *English Grammar*, p. 78.

³ *The English Language*, p. 74.

⁴ *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 109.

⁵ *Philology of the English Tongue*, p. 457.

⁶ *Advanced English Grammar*, p. 69.

Webster recognizes it, quoting a sentence from Dryden. The *Encyclopedic Dictionary* says, “‘Which’ sometimes has *whose* as its genitive,” and quotes a passage from Milton but from no recent author. Professor O. F. Emerson¹ says, “The genitive *whose* became restricted to personal use, although *whose* as a neuter genitive is found in literature, especially poetry.” This last statement is certainly true, and is the same statement made by Genung in his college textbooks. Emerson’s words “found in literature” will seem like a decided understatement when compared with the number of authors cited in this section.

T. L. K. Oliphant² says that this *whose* is found in the *Romaunt of the Rose*, which he dates about A.D. 1520 and Skeat “after 1500”; also that it is used by Tyndale about 1525. As it is found in Malory, Bale, and other early authors, it can hardly be called very modern in origin.

The following table will show at least 140 authors that use the neuter *whose*. Many more could be found, but there is a limit to human endurance; writer and reader alike would become exhausted. The genitive *whose* is universal in poetry and exceedingly common in prose.

Thomas Malory	1	Sir Thomas Browne.....	10
John Bale	1	Samuel Daniel	1
Gorboduc	2	John Donne	1
Earl of Surrey	2	Milton	22
Beaumont and Fletcher.....	4	Andrew Marvell	1
King James Bible	14	Bunyan	1
Spenser	10	Jeremy Taylor.....	10
Shakespeare	57	Defoe	1
George Chapman.....	3	Dryden	17
Marlowe	26	Addison	2
Massinger	4	Pope	9
Fletcher and Shakespeare.....	1	Prior	4
John Webster	1	Fielding	4
Ben Jonson	1	Dr. Johnson	3

¹ *History of the English Language*, p. 338.

² *The New English*, I, pp. 401, 429.

Gibbon	15	Bayard Taylor.....	33
Bishop Berkeley	1	Whittier	2
Cowper	1	Kingsley	2
James Thomson	2	Sir John Lubbock	1
Geo. Campbell	5	Bulwer	7
Thomas Gray	3	Milman	2
William Collins	4	Dean Stanley	4
Dr. H. Blair.....	4	William Morris.....	6
Jane Austen	2	Holmes	4
Franklin	1	Sidney Lanier	6
Philip Freneau	10	Dean Trench	8
Audubon	1	P. H. Hayne	30
Burke	2	Isaac D'Israeli	2
Lamb	5	James Bryce	8
Thomas Campbell	1	William Minto	2
Byron	5	Kittredge and Greenough.....	5
Irving	3	Saintsbury	2
Coleridge	3	Dr. E. A. Abbott.....	1
Wordsworth	31	Lounsbury	13
Shelley	20	S. Weir Mitchell	1
Keats	6	J. F. Genung.....	45
Scott	16	McMaster	2
Southey	6	T. B. Aldrich.....	1
Hallam	1	H. W. Mabie.....	28
A. H. Clough.....	4	Henry Drummond	1
Wendell Phillips.....	3	Phoebe Cary.....	4
Sir William Hamilton.....	6	Huxley	8
Longfellow	26	Christina Rossetti	1
Lowell	22	Sidney Dobell	1
Earl of Derby	2	Jean Ingelow	1
Beaconsfield	1	Mrs. Gaskell	1
Tennyson	9	Pollok	3
James Montgomery	1	Bryant	15
J. A. Froude.....	4	Hawthorne	2
Emerson	18	Matthew Arnold	11
Sir Francis Palgrave.....	2	George Eliot	1
Halleek	1	Dickens	15
Phillips Brooks	5	Macaulay	8
E. A. Freeman.....	2	De Quincey	3
E. P. Whipple.....	1	Carlyle	7
Thackeray	2	Motley	7
Newman	2	Prescott	7

Cooper	17	George William Curtis	14
Poe ¹	65	G. W. Cable	16
Ruskin	4	Mrs. H. Ward.....	3
Fitzedward Hall	1	Henry Sweet	3
D. G. Rossetti.....	11	Price Collier	1
F. W. Faber.....	1	W. D. Whitney	24
Bagehot	1	Bret Harte.....	16
Mrs. Browning	1	Stopford Brooke	6
Richard Grant White.....	2	D. G. Mitchell	4
Browning	8	John Burroughs	1
Horace Greeley.....	1	Dr. C. Geikie.....	1
Mrs. H. B. Stowe.....	1	T. N. Page.....	6
Thoreau	1	John Morley	1
Kipling	2	Leslie Stephen	1
Henry van Dyke.....	4	Professor John Earle.....	8
Edward Dowden	2	Stedman	3
Stephen Phillips	2	Swinburne	3
Katharine Lee Bates.....	9	Stevenson	6
George P. Marsh.....	3	W. W. Skeat.....	1

Here are more than 140 authors, in about 1050 passages, all the way down for more than 400 years. Are there any authors left to name?

The results of this study of the neuter *whose* amazed the present writer: he is fully prepared to endorse the statement made by Lounsbury that this *whose* is used by every author entitled to be called an authority.²

Let us draw a few inferences from the table. (1) The *whose* under discussion is used by the rhetorical scholars of various epochs, such as Campbell, Hugh Blair, and J. F. Genung. (2) It is used freely by such distinguished writers as Milton, Johnson, Matthew Arnold, Lowell, Emerson, and Longfellow. (3) Though its greatest use is in poetry, where it seems to be universal, it is used frequently in prose by Sir Thomas Browne, Poe, Dickens, Cooper, George William Curtis, Lounsbury, Genung, Mabie, Cable, W. D. Whitney, and Hawthorne.

¹ Mostly in his prose.

² *The Standard of Usage in English*, p. 109.

A casual reading of the table will show that the neuter *whose* made enormous gains in the nineteenth century: the attacks of the older grammarians and the "faint praise" of some of the best recent grammarians seemed to add strength to its pinions.

The writer has not seen a single case of *of which* in poetry; indeed he cannot imagine a poet's using such a stilted locution. This very stiffness will probably doom *of which* to extinction except in puristic circles.

Some prose writers cited as using *whose* use *of which* frequently. Among these are Macaulay, H. W. Mabie, Scott, and Hawthorne. Macaulay generally uses *of which*, much to the injury of his style.

In conclusion: why did this *whose* incur such opposition? It is certainly more convenient, more concise, more euphonious, and less cumbersome than *of which*. It is historically neuter as well as masculine. Again: why did some of its enemies or its lukewarm friends say that good authors avoid it? We may answer with a wise saw from Gould Brown, the most voluminous of the old grammarians. After criticizing one of his predecessors for his unqualified condemnation of the *whose* in question, he said, "Grammarians would perhaps differ less if they would read more." That is gospel wisdom.

The authors that avoid *whose* are in a small minority. They are probably the same men that boycott the progressive passive verb phrase and other locutions well established except in some small localities.

One more reference to the list. Among those using this *whose* we find such guardians of good English as Pope, Dr. Johnson, Baskervill, Minto, Sweet, Kittredge, Lounsbury, and Whitney, all of whom are recognized as pure though not puristic in their English.

Though it might seem unnecessary to quote a few passages where thousands are available, the writer will show how some of our greatest authors use the *whose* of inanimate objects.

The ghost in *Hamlet* says:

I could a tale unfold *whose* lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul.

In the Bible (*Deut.* 8:9) we read, "a land *whose* stones are iron, and out of *whose* hills thou mayest dig brass." Try of *which* in this passage. Milton says,

Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden Tree, *whose* mortal taste
Brought death into the world, *etc.*

Addison in the *Spectator* says, "Huygenius carries this thought so far, that he does not think it impossible there may be stars *whose* light is not yet traveled down to us," *etc.* Pope (*Eloise to Abelard*) says,

Relentless walls! *whose* darksome sound contains
Repentant sighs, and voluntary pains.

Dryden says, "that play . . . whose plot or action is," *etc.* De Quincey says, "a writer who had looked behind the curtain of fate, and had seen the forge at *whose* fires the shafts of Heaven were even now being forged." Matthew Arnold in his essay on Gray says, "Gray, a born poet, fell upon an age of prose. He fell upon an age *whose* task was such as to call forth in general men's powers of understanding, wit," *etc.* Newman says, "gaze around the bay of Baiæ, *whose* rocks have been made to serve as the foundations and the walls of palaces." Macaulay says, "a religion *whose* creed they do not understand, and *whose* precepts they habitually disobey." Macaulay, however, as already said, generally uses of *which*, much to the injury of his cadences and his euphony.

CXXXIX

WORDS OF RELATIONSHIP

Words of relationship have always been vague in English; some are very uncertain at present. In Anglo-Saxon, for instance, *nefa* meant *nephew*, *grandson*, and *stepson*; *nevene* meant *niece* and *granddaughter*; *maga* meant *son* or *relative*. Chaucer uses *nevew* for *grandson* in the *House of Fame*. Shakespeare uses *cousin* in the most general way, sometimes for *nephew*, *niece*, *uncle*, *brother-in-law*, *grandchild*. He also uses *nephew* with the meaning of *cousin* and *grandson*. In the Bible *nephews* is used for *grandchildren*. *Nephew* started out in modern English with the meaning of *grandchild* or some more remote descendant: it is so used by Holinshed, Jeremy Taylor, and Dr. Johnson. In Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, Pandarus calls his niece *cousin*. Dr. Johnson uses *daughter-in-law* for *stepdaughter*. Jane Austen uses *brothers-in-law* of two men married to two sisters, and this still obtains to some extent among the upper classes. Fielding, Macaulay, and Thackeray use *son-in-law* for *stepson*, and we still hear this in polite circles. In *Pickwick*, Dickens frequently uses *mother-in-law* for *step-mother*. This vagueness is still seen in the language and is recognized in a few of the dictionaries.

This vagueness is not confined to English: the Latin *nepos* is very uncertain, meaning *grandson*, *nephew*, *descendant*. In French, *neveu* in the plural means *offspring*, *posterity*.

In America, terms of relationship vary in different localities. In some parts of the country, *cousin-german* is used for *first cousin*. *Second cousins* in the South are *third cousins* in some other parts of the United States. *First cousin once removed* is sometimes heard in the Southern states, in Illinois, Maine, and New Brunswick: *second cousin* sounds too distant for clannish families. *Own cousin* is heard in some parts of the United States for *first cousin*.

The clannishness in Virginia has affected these terms of relationship. Sometimes the children of a second marriage are taught to "cousin" the relatives of the first wife or husband; in fact, they sometimes use all the terms of blood-relationship.

Dr. Johnson, writing of his step-daughter, says: "*My daughter-in-law*, from whom I expected most, and whom I met with sincere benevolence, has lost," etc. In *Troilus and Cressida*, Pandarus says to his niece, "Good morrow, *cousin* Cressid." "How do you, *cousin*?" "Well, *cousin*, I told you a thing yesterday; think on't." In *Hamlet*, King Claudius says to his nephew and stepson, "How fares our *cousin* Hamlet?" In the Bible¹ clause, "if any widow have children or *nephews*," the word *nephews* has not the meaning now attached to it in the language. In *Pickwick*, chapter 28 is entitled "Samuel Weller Makes a Pilgrimage to Dorking, and Beholds His *Mother-in-Law*." A few lines below, we read, "It occurred to him so strongly that he ought to go down to see his father, and pay his duty to his *mother-in-law*." In both places Dickens means *step-mother*. Confusion of the kind cited from Dickens is not uncommon in America.

CXL

YESTERNIGHT

My lord, I think I saw him yesternight. (*Hamlet*.)

Is the word *yesternight* still available for the purposes of poetry? If a poet cares to take Shakespeare alone as his model he can find certainly twelve passages in Cowden-Clarke's concordance; but it is easy to bring the word down to our own period.

The Century Dictionary quotes a passage from James Howell (died 1666), famous for his *Letters*; also one from

¹ *I Tim.* 5, 4.

Walter Scott and one from Tennyson's *Ode to Memory*. To these the writer can add one from Latimer, one from Charles Lamb, one from Thomas Campbell, one each from Tennyson's *Second Song* and *The Princess*, one from Alice Cary.

The poets do not hesitate to use *yestereve*, *yester evening*, and other compounds of *yester*. Rossetti's "But where are the snows of *yester-year*" is familiar to all readers of poetry. Shakespeare has lent perpetual dignity to *yesternight*. We see it sporadically in the verses of recent poets, and believe they have good authority for it. *Last night* is so commonplace that a poet might naturally recur to the less hackneyed form under discussion.

A few extracts will show how this word is used by the best authors.

Charles Lamb in a letter written in 1800 says, "But that worthy man and excellent poet, George Dyer, made me a visit *yesternight*." Tennyson in *Second Song* says,

Thy tuwhits are lull'd, I wot,
Thy tuwhoos of *yesternight*.

Alice Cary in a poem entitled *Yesternight* says,

Yesternight—how long it seems!
Met I in the land of dreams
One that, *etc.*

Tennyson's *ycstermorn* is familiar to all readers of that poet.

The writer does not wish to "resurrect" this old word but is simply calling attention to the wide use of *yesternight* in literature.

CXLI

YOU WAS

The present writer will not try to prove that *you was* is good literary English in the twentieth century. He will simply show that it has not been out of vogue as long as some might

imagine and that, even in quite recent years, it was not confined to the illiterate classes.

T. L. K. Oliphant,¹ citing Bentley, the greatest scholar of Queen Anne's day, as using *you was* in 1699, says that this locution was then just coming into the language. Vanbrugh used it in his works between 1697 and 1703. Pope, writing to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in 1718, says, "I shall look upon you as so many years younger than you *was*." George Campbell (1719-1776) says that it was pretty common in colloquial English in his day. Thomas Jefferson, who was thirty-three years old when Campbell made that statement, used it sometimes in his correspondence, which covered the period from about 1800 to 1826. This would indicate that *you was* was in good standing in America after the opening of the last century. Charles Lamb uses *you was* in a letter to William Hazlitt in 1805 and *was you?* in a letter to another correspondent in 1808. This proves that the locution was in good repute among English authors in the early part of the nineteenth century. The author remembers a person of the very best social standing born in the early part of the last century who used *you was* regularly: no doubt many readers of this volume can do the same. If Lamb could use it about 1800 and Jefferson about 1820, it must have had considerable vogue in polite colloquial English at that period.

Quackenbos,² while putting *you was* among his "everyday misusages," says, "*You was* is a solecism almost as old as the fashion of addressing a person in high station in the plural number." This conflicts with Oliphant's statement that it came in about 1700 and stayed a hundred years. Fitzedward Hall³ in 1873 says, "inelegant," but "used to be sanctioned by persons of the highest education." He cites Cowper, Bishop Shipley, Horace Walpole, and others as having used it.

¹ *The New English*, II, p. 133.

² *Practical Rhetoric*, 1896, pp. 246, 247.

³ *Modern English*, pp. 208, 209.

Mätzner,¹ quoting passages from Sheridan, Fielding, Chat-ham, and J. Fenimore Cooper, says, "The form *was* for the second person plural has become naturalized even in the nobler sphere." (*sic.*)

You was is under a cloud now but may emerge again as a good locution. It filled a useful niche in the language, enabling one to address another without any danger of ambiguity. At present we must remember Pope's advice:

Nor be the last to lay the old aside.

Logically and etymologically, *you was* addressed to one person is just as good as "you were"; both are mixed-breeds: it is custom alone that has put down one and exalted the other. "You were" was once a neologism and an intruder. It should be added, however, that *you was* has not been common in the English of the higher classes for a long time; it is usually a sign of inferior station.

Lounsbury in a recent number of a popular magazine discussed *you was*. He said that it was used by the best writers and in polite society for a hundred and fifty years. He cites the following persons, authors, and correspondences:

Dryden	Swift	Young
Fielding	Beattie	Walpole Correspondence
Richardson	Richard Bentley	Byron
Dugald Stewart	Goldsmith	Lamb
Pope	Cowper	Mrs. Ann Radcliffe
Lady Mary Wortley	Atterbury	William IV
Montagu	Smollett	

A recent case of *you was* occurs in G. W. Cable's *Dr. Sevier*. Cable puts it into the mouth of Dr. Sevier, a cultivated Louisiana physician of about 1850: "There must have been some mistake made when *you was* put upon the earth."

¹ *English Grammar* (Greece's translation), II, 153.

INDEX

- A-building, 224.
 Above, used as adjective, 30, 31, 32.
 Accept, with of, 27; without of, 27.
 Account, settle an, 255.
 Adjectives, not generally compared.
 "chief," "complete," "correct,"
 "dead," "excellent," "extreme."
 "favorite," "perfect," "principal."
 "supreme," "unanimous," "unique,"
 "universal," 28, 29; adverbs, used
 as, "above," "after," "almost,"
 "down," "hither," "often," "outer,"
 "seldom," "sometime," "then," 30-
 38; used as adverbs, "mighty," 159-
 162; "pretty," 217-219; "right,"
 249-251; "such," 275, 276;
 "plenty" as predicate, 196-198;
 "rather," as, 121; verbals, used as,
 "cultivated," "cultured," "gifted,"
 "moneyed," "talented," 66, 67, 286-
 288; singular as substantives, 262,
 263; ending in "ed," 286-288.
 Admit of, 27.
 Adverbs, used as adjectives, "above,"
 "after," "almost," "down," "hither,"
 "often," "outer," "seldom," "some-
 time," "then," 30-38; adjectives,
 used as, "mighty," 159-162;
 "pretty," 217-219; "right," 249-
 251; "such," 275, 276; "that" as,
 296, 297.
 After, used as adjective, 32, 33; as ad-
 verb, 38, 39; for afterwards, 38, 39.
 Afternoon, of a, 185.
 Afterwards, 38, 39.
 Agreement of infinitive with tense of
 predicate verb, 289.
 Almost, used as adjective, 30, 33.
 Also (but) with not only, 181-183.
 Anglicized foreign plurals, 109.
 Antecedent, to a relative clause, pos-
 sessive case as, 208-211; rarely im-
 plied in possessive adjective, 209;
 neuter, of whose, 320-327.
 Anybody else, 87, 88.
 Anybody else's, 87, 88.
 As me, 153.
 As thee meaning as thou, 303.
 At last, 40, 41, 42.
 At length, 40, 41, 42.
 At length meaning at last, 40, 41, 42.
 Ate, eat for, 80, 81.
 Athletics, singular or plural, 39, 40.
 Back-formations, "beg" from "beg-
 gar," "resurrect" from "resurrec-
 tion," 243.
 Bandit, 109.
 Beat, meaning defeat, 42, 43.
 Beaus, 158.
 Beautifullest, 281.
 Beg, 73; from beggar, 243.
 Believe, presume for, 127.
 Better, with had, 117, 120; with
 would, 117.
 Between, 43, 44; between each
 (every), 43, 44.
 Bill, collect a, 52; settle a, 255.
 Blue-eyed, 286.
 Boat, catch a, 50.
 Brave, as noun, 263.
 But, 44-46; as preposition, 44; with
 nominative, 44-46; (also) with not
 only, 181-183.
 Calculated with the infinitive, 47-49.
 Can, 49, 50; as independent verb, 49,
 50; found in poetry, 49, 50.
 Catch a post (train, boat), 50.
 Caught, for caught, 51.
 Caught, caught for, 51.
 Chief, comparison of, 28.
 Clause, misplaced relative, 162-165.
 Cognate object, 247.
 Collect a bill, 52.
 Common friend, 172; mutual, for, 172-
 175.

- Comparative, double, 74; "useless encumbrance," 280.
- Comparison of adjective, 28, 29.
- Commence "-author," "-patriot," 52; verbal noun after, 52; followed by infinitive, 52.
- Complete, comparison of, 28.
- Conceited, 286.
- Confidence, implicit, 130-132.
- Conjunction, directly, as; immediately as; instantly as, 71, 72; now, as, 72; once, as, 72, 183; now, as, 183-185; directly, immediately, instantly, once, as, 184.
- Consider, etymology of, 59; meaning regard, 58-60.
- Conspiracy, conspire associated with, 60.
- Conspire, meaning concur, 60, 61; meaning agree, 60, 61.
- Constant, 61-63.
- Constantly, 61-63.
- Constant(ly) meaning continual(ly), 61-63.
- Contemporary, cotemporary meaning, 63, 64.
- Coördinating relative, that as, 297-303.
- Corpse, dead, 67, 68.
- Correct, comparison of, 28.
- Cotemporary, meaning contemporary, 63, 64.
- Couple of, a, 64-66.
- Cousin, 328, 329.
- Cows, kine for, 145, 146.
- Criteria, 109.
- Cultivated, as adjective, 67.
- Cultured, as adjective, 66, 67.
- Dangling participle, 165-171.
- Dare say, I, 127.
- Demean, meaning debase or degrade oneself, 68, 69.
- Dependable, 242.
- Derivation, 47.
- Description, meaning kind, sort, 69, 70.
- Dead, comparison of, 28; as noun, 262, 263.
- Dead corpse, 67, 68.
- Defeat, 42, 43.
- Defeat, beat meaning, 42, 43.
- Difficultly, 70.
- Direct object, 247.
- Directly, as a conjunction, 71, 72, 184.
- Dived, dove, for, 78.
- Donate, 73.
- Donation, 73.
- Double negative, 75-77.
- Dove, for dived, 78.
- Down, used as adjective, 30.
- Drank, as participle, 79.
- Drunk, 79.
- Each (every) with between, 43, 44; of two, either referring to, 84, 85.
- Eat, for ate, 80, 81; for eaten, 81, 82.
- Eaten, eat for, 81, 82.
- Ed adjectives, blue-eyed, conceited, gifted, good-natured, moneyed, renowned, talented, 286, 287.
- Editorial, as a noun, 82, 83.
- Either, meaning each of two, 84, 85; meaning more than two, 85, 86.
- Ellipses, 272.
- Else, forms in, "anybody's else," "nobody's else," "somebody else," "whose else," 86-88.
- Else's, forms in, "anybody else's," "everybody else's," "nobody else's," "somebody else's," "who else's," 86-88.
- Encounter, 89, 90.
- Ending sentence with preposition, 213-217.
- Errata, 109.
- Ethics, singular or plural, 201.
- Etymology, 59.
- Evening, of a, 185.
- Ever so, 90-94.
- Every with between, 43, 44; as a pronoun, 94, 95.
- Everybody else's, 88.
- Evidence, as a verb, 95, 96.
- Excellent, comparison of, 29.
- Execute, meaning put to death, 96-98.
- Execution, 97, 98.
- Expect, suspect better than, 283.
- Explicit, 130, 132.
- Extreme, comparison of, 28.
- Fascinate, 73.
- Fair, as noun, 263.

- Favorite, comparison of, 28.
 Female, as a noun, 99-102; as an adjective, 102, 103; not a perversion of language, 103, 104.
 First two, 104-106.
 Firstly, 107, 108.
 Foreign plurals anglicized, bandit, criteria, errata, genera, memorandums, radii, rendezvouses, serieses, 109; beaus, 158; mechanics, 157; formulas, 158; pheuomenons, 158; metaphysics, 159; bandits, 158.
 Foremost, 74, 150.
 Formulas, 158.
 Friend, mutual, 172-175.

 Genera, 109.
 Genitive, s-, inflectional (old) phrasal, 207.
 Gerund, misrelated, 165-171.
 Gifted, as adjective, 67, 287.
 Give, donate better than, 73.
 Goodnatured, 286.
 Got, 109-112; with have, 121-123.
 Gotten, 109-112.
 Graduate, as an active verb, 113.
 Grandchildren, 328.
 Grateful, meaning pleasant, 114.
 Grow, meaning become, 115, 116.
 Guess and reckon, 231-235; for think, suppose, 233.

 Had better, 117, 120.
 Had lever, 119.
 Had rather, 116-121.
 Hanging participle, 166-171.
 Handsomest, 281.
 Hardly, substitute for difficultly, 71.
 He (him), himself for, 175.
 Heighth (highth) for height, 124.
 Highth, 124.
 Himself for he (him), 175.
 Hither, used as adjective, 33, 34.

 I (me), myself for, 175-177.
 I am mistaken, 125-127.
 "I got it" for "I have it," 123.
 I take it, 128, 129.
 I presume, 127, 128.
 Ill, sick for, 256-261.
 Imagine, suspect meaning, 283, 284.

 Immediately, as conjunction, 71, 72, 184.
 Immense, 129, 130.
 Immensely, 129, 130.
 Immensest, 281.
 In our (their, your) midst, 132-134.
 Implicit confidence, 130-132.
 Individual for man, 134-136.
 Indirect object, 247.
 Indispensable, 240.
 Infinitive, with calculated, 47-49; with commence, 52; split, 266-271; misrelated, 290; tense of, 288-290.
 Inflectional genitive (old), 207, 210.
 Ing forms, with 's, 136, 137, 139-143; without 's, 136-143.
 Instantly, as conjunction, 71, 72, 184.
 Interrogative particle, whether as, 315-317.
 Irregular nominative, me as, 294.
 Irregular superlatives, "beautifullest," "exquisitest," "diligentest," "powerfullest," "patientest," "peaceablest," etc., 281, 282.

 Is as old plural, 54-58.
 Is being built, 220.
 Is building, 220.
 It is me, 154, 157.
 It was me, 156.

 Jeopard, 143, 144.
 Jeopardize, 143, 144.
 Journal, editorial for, 83, 144, 145.

 Kind, 69, 70.
 Kine for cows, 145, 146.

 Laughable, 240.
 Leave, quit meaning, 229-231.
 Lend, loan for, 150, 151.
 Length, at, 40-42.
 Lengthy, 146, 147.
 Lesser, 74, 148-150.
 Living, as noun, 263.
 Loan, as a verb, 150, 151; meaning lend, 150, 151.
 Locutions, 29, 30, 31, 153, 210, 254, 291.
 Long, lengthy for, 146, 147.
 Lever, with had, 119.

- Malaprops, 47.
 Man, individual for, 134-136.
 Mathematics, 152.
 Me. as quasi-nominative, 153-157;
 (I), myself for, 175-177; as irreg-
 ular nominative, 294.
 Mechanics, 157.
 Memorandum, 109, 157-159.
 Metaphysics, 159.
 Midst, in our (their, your), 132-134.
 Mighty, as adverb, 159-162; in epic
 poetry, 160; very, preferred to, 161.
 "Misapprehended" participle, 170.
 Misplaced relative clause, 162-165.
 Misrelated infinitive, 290.
 Misrelated participle (or gerund),
 165-171.
 Mistaken, 125-127.
 Moneyed, as adjective, 67; 286.
 More elder, 74.
 Morning, of a, 185-187.
 Most unkindest, 74.
 Mother-in-law, 328.
 "Muchly," 107.
 Mutual friend, 172-175; for common,
 172-175.
 My meaning of me, 208.
 Myself for I (me), 175-177.
- Negative, double, 75-77.
 Nephew, 328.
 Neuter, plural subject, 53, 54; ante-
 cedent of whose, 320-327.
 Never so, 90-94.
 Nobody else, 87, 88.
 Nobody else's, 87, 88.
 Nominative, with but, 44-46.
 None, singular or plural, 177-180.
 Not only—but (also), 181-183.
 Nouns, adjectives as, "brave," "dead,"
 "living," "rich," 262, 263.
 Now, as conjunction, 72, 183-185;
 meaning since, 184.
- Object, passive verb cannot take, 245;
 retained, 244-248.
 Of-genitive with inanimate objects,
 202, 203, 206.
 Of-phrases, 206.
 Of, verbs with, 27; with remember,
 242, 243.
 Of a morning, 185, 187.
- Of which with neuter antecedent, 320-
 322; not in poetry, 326.
 Often, used as adjective, 31, 34.
 "On byldung," 224.
 On meaning in, 224.
 Once, as conjunction, 72, 183, 184.
 Onliest, 74.
 Only, not—but (also), 181, 183; posi-
 tion of, 187-193; adverb, 187.
 Onto, form correct, 193; analogy with
 into, 193; not equivalent to on to,
 194.
 Optics, singular or plural, 201.
 Outer, used as adjective, 30.
- Partial, meaning in part, 195.
 Partially for partly, 194-196.
 Participle "drank" as, "rang" as, 79;
 dangling, 165-171; hanging, 166;
 misrelated, 165-171; "proven" as,
 227-229.
 Particle, splitting, 272-275; whether,
 as interrogative, 315-317.
 Partly, partially for, 194-196.
 Past tense, of infinitive, 289; with
 tomorrow, 308.
 "Passive object," 247.
 Passive verb phrase, progressive, 219-
 227.
 Peddle, 73.
 Perfect, comparison of, 28.
 Periodical, journal for, 144, 145.
 "Persecuted" participle, 170.
 Person, individual for, 134-136.
 Persons, what used of, 314, 315.
 Phrasal genitive, 207, 210.
 Phenomenons, 158.
 Physics, singular or plural, 201.
 Pleasant, grateful meaning, 114.
 Plenty as predicate adjective, 196-198.
 Pleonastic pronoun, 198, 199.
 Plural subjects with singular verb, 53-
 58; foreign, anglicized, 109.
 Politics, singular or plural, 199-202.
 Possessive case, with living persons,
 202, 203, 206, 207; with inanimate
 objects, 204-206; with time expres-
 sions, 203; with some idioms, 203;
 as antecedents to relative pronouns,
 208-211.
 Post, catch a, 50.
 Pound, as plural, 212.

- Predicate adjective, plenty as, 196-198.
- Preposition at end of sentence, 213-217; than as a, 292.
- Present tense with tomorrow, 308.
- Presume, I, meaning I dare say, 127, 128.
- Pretty, as adverb, 217-219.
- Principal, comparison of, 28.
- Progressive passive verb phrase, 219-227.
- Pronoun, every as, 94, 95; pleonastic, 198, 199; relative, possessive case as antecedent to, 208-211.
- Proved, 227-229.
- Proven, as a participle, 227-229.
- Publication, journal for, 144, 145.
- Purists, 147.
- Quasi-nominative, me as, 153-157; thee as, 303, 304.
- Quasi-preposition "but," 252; "save," "saving," 251, 252; "than," 291-296.
- Quit, meaning cease, stop, 231; meaning leave, go away from, 229-231.
- Radii, 109.
- Rang, 79.
- "Rathe," 121.
- Rather, with had, 116-121; with would, 116-121; as adjective, 121.
- Reckon, and guess, 231-235; reckon for think, suppose, 232.
- Redundant that, 235, 236.
- Regard, 58-60.
- Reliable, 239-242.
- Rely upon, 239.
- Remember of, 242, 243.
- Relationship, words of brother-in-law, cousin, daughter-in-law, grandchildren, nephew, stepson, 328, 329.
- Relative, clause misplaced, 162-165; pronoun, possessive case as antecedent to, 208-211; that, before a pause, 236-239; coördinating, that as, 297-303.
- Rendezvouses, 109.
- Renowned, 286.
- Resurrect, 243, 244.
- Resurrection, resurrect formed from, 243.
- Retained object, 244-248.
- Revive, resurrect, for, 244.
- Rich, as noun, 262.
- Right as adverb, 249-251.
- s-genitive, 207.
- s possessive, with inanimate objects, 204-206.
- 's with ing forms, 136, 137, 139-143.
- Save, a conjunction, a preposition, a participle (absolute), 251; like but, with objective case, 251; quasi-preposition with nominative case, 252; rarer than but with nominative case, 252.
- Saving with nominative case, 251, 252.
- Sat, 266.
- Scarcely, substitute for difficultly, 71.
- Scour meaning search, range over, 253, 254.
- Search, scour meaning, 253, 254.
- Secondly, 108.
- Seldom, used as adjective, 31, 35.
- Self forms, 176, 177.
- Serieses, 109.
- Set or sit, 264-266.
- Settle an account, 255.
- Sick and sickness, 255-261.
- Singulars or plurals, "athletics," 39; "mathematics," 152; "mechanics," 157; "memorandums," 157-159; "metaphysics," 159; "none," 177-180; "politics," 199-202; "ethics," "physics," "optics," 201; "pound," 212.
- Singular adjective as substantive, 262, 263.
- Singular verb with plural subject, 53-58.
- Sit or set, 264-266.
- Smaller, lesser for, 148-150.
- So, with ever and never, 90-94.
- Somebody else, 86, 88.
- Somebody else's, 86, 88.
- Sometime, used as adjective, 30, 31, 35.
- Sort, 69, 70.
- Split infinitive, 266-271.
- Splitting particles, 272-275.
- Step-mother, 328.
- Stop, quit, meaning, 231.

- Subject and verb, agreement of, 53-58 ;
non-agreement of, 53-58.
- Subjunctive were, *was* for, 311-314.
- Such, as adverb, 275, 276 ; an one,
276-279.
- Substantives, singular adjectives as,
262, 263.
- Superlatives, double, 74 ; used of two,
279, 280 ; formed irregularly, 281,
282.
- Suppose, 1, 128 ; suspect, meaning,
283, 284.
- Supreme, comparison of, 28.
- Suspect meaning suppose, imagine,
283, 284.
- Sympathy with (for in) as to persons,
284, 285 ; as to things, 285.
- Take it, I, meaning I understand, 128,
129.
- Talented, as adjective, 67, 286-288.
- Taste of, 27.
- Taught, taught for, 51.
- "Teached," 51.
- Tense, of infinitive, 288-290 ; with to-
morrow, 308.
- Than as a quasi-preposition, 291-296.
- Than me, 153.
- Than who, 291-296.
- Than whom, 291-296.
- That, redundant, 235, 236 ; relative,
before a pause, 236-239 ; better than
who, 237 ; in popular speech, 296 ;
as adverb, 296, 297 ; for relative
who, 297 ; in a restrictive clause,
299 ; as coördinating relative, 297-
303.
- That's me, 153.
- Thee as quasi-nominative, 303, 304.
- Then, used as adjective, 30, 31, 36.
- Think for, 305.
- Think, suspect meaning, 283, 284.
- Thirdly, 108.
- "Thusly," 107.
- Thought for, 305.
- Thousand, with a, 305, 306 ; with an,
305, 306.
- Thrived or throve, 306, 307.
- Thriven, rare, 307 ; succeeded, prospered
synonyms for, 307.
- Throughly, 308.
- Throve, or thrived, 306, 307.
- Tomorrow, with present tense, 308 ;
with past tense, 308.
- Train, catch a, 50.
- Trustworthy, less euphonious than re-
liable, 240, 241.
- Try, with and, 309 ; with to, 309.
- Two, couple of, used for, 64-66 ; "two
first," 104-106 ; superlative, used of,
279, 280.
- Unaccountable, 240.
- Unanimous, comparison of, 28.
- Under, used as adjective, 37, 38.
- Undercurrent, 38.
- Underking, 38.
- Understand, 1, 128.
- Ungrateful, meaning unpleasant, 114.
- Unique, comparison of, 28.
- Unity, lack of, 166.
- Universal, comparison of, 28.
- Unpleasant, ungrateful, meaning, 114.
- Verb and subject, agreement of, 53-58 ;
non-agreement of, 53-58.
- Verb phrase, progressive passive, 219-
227.
- Verbal noun, the, following commence,
52.
- Verbs, with of, 27 ; evidence as, 95,
96 ; experience as, 98, 99 ; graduate
as, 113 ; loan as, 150, 151 ; voice as,
310, 311.
- Very preferred to mighty, 161, 162.
- Voice as a verb, 310, 311.
- Was, as old plural, 55-58 ; for subjunc-
tive were, 311-314.
- Was you? 331.
- Wax, 115.
- Were, subjunctive, was for, 311-314.
- What used of persons, 314, 315.
- Whether, as interrogative particle,
315-317 ; meaning which of two,
315.
- Which, that for, 298.
- Who else's, 88.
- Who, that for, 297 ; for whom, 317-
319.

- Whom, who for, 317-319.
Whose, of which instead of, 320; on
equality with personal use, 321;
referring to neuter antecedents,
320-327; used in poetry, 326.
Whose else, 88.
Wonderfulest, 281.
Words of relationship, 328, 329.
Would better, 117.
Would rather, 116-121.
Yestereve, 330.
Yestermorn, 330.
Yesternight, 329, 330.
Yester-year, 330.
You was, 331-333.

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

AUG 9 1945

SEP 2 1955

OCT 22 1956

OCT 20 1967

1957

7 '51

Apr 30 '58

Oct 24 '60

REC-116

MAR 28 1963

MAR 30 1985

LD-URL

MAR 31 1965

P.M.

71813

11821254516

Form L-9-35m-8, '28

WED. 10:00AM

1862

NOV 3 1970

REC'D LD-URL

OCT 26 1972

SEP 13 1983

REC'D LD-URZ

SEP 08 1928

RECEIVED
MAIN LOAN DESK

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 352 369 3



3 1158 00882 6835

7B

